LIST OF WORKS BY LORD MACAULAY.

THE HISTORY of ENGLAND from the Accession

LORD MACAULAY'S HISTORY of ENGLAND

MISCELLANEOUS WRITINGS of Lord MACAULAY:

CRITICAL and HISTORICAL ESSAYS contributed

LORD MACAULAY'S CRITICAL and HISTORICAL ESSAYS

LORD MACAULAY'S CRITICAL and HISTORICAL ESSAYS

LORD MACAULAY'S CRITICAL and HISTORICAL ESSAYS

LIST of Fourteen of Lord MACAULAY'S ESSAYS

LAYS of ANCIENT ROME. By the Right Hon.

LORD MACAULAY'S LAYS of ANCIENT ROME,

SPEECHES of the Right Hon. Lord MACAULAY,

LORD MACAULAY'S SPEECHES on PARLIAMENTARY

A

CRITICAL HISTORY

OF THE

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

OF

ANTIENT GREECE.

VOL. I.

Digitized by Google

LONDON:
A. and G. A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-street-Square.

A

CRITICAL HISTORY

OF THE

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

OF

ANTIENT GREECE.

BY

WILLIAM MURE

OF CALDWELL.

SECOND EDITION.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS.

1854.

PREFACE.

THE only material alterations or augmentations that have been made in this edition, are: First, the incorporation in the text, of the few passages annexed to each volume of the first edition, under the head of "Additions and Corrections"; Secondly, the supplementary Appendix N. to Volume III., in reply to two Appendices to the second volume of Mr. Grote's History of Greece [3rd edit.], in which opinions expressed in this work have been controverted. With this exception, the author has not found it necessary to notice in detail the many, and for the most part indulgent and judicious criticisms, with which his labours have been honoured by the press of his own country.

He cannot however withhold a few remarks on the fourteen lines of unhandsome and disingenuous commentary, bestowed on his volumes by Professor Nitzsch of Kiel, in the preface to a recent work, entitled "Sagenpoesie der Griechen" (Kiel, 1852). It will be proper to apprise the English reader, that Professor Nitzsch was for many years distinguished among the scholars of Germany, by his zealous advocacy of the doctrine as to the Separate authorship of the Iliad and Odyssey, and that, in his lately published volume, he advances a new claim to the

consideration of the classical public, by an equally zealous repudiation of that doctrine.

In the passage of his Preface above referred to[1], he begins by stating: that "he has looked into an English work entitled a Critical History of Greek Literature, &c., but has not found occasion to make any use of its contents." Several reasons suggest themselves, for this unwillingness to aid the promulgation of that work among his own countrymen.

In the first place, a portion of it is devoted to the confutation of his once favourite Separatist theory, and to an exposure of the errors and fallacies of which he had been guilty in its support.

In the next place, Professor Nitzsch having now abandoned that theory, and declared his adherence to the doctrine of a single Homer, on grounds chiefly borrowed from[2] or anticipated in these pages, it was quite natural that he should wish his recantation to

[1] "Gleichzeitig mit dieser Arbeit, kam aus England ein im Ergebniss des Einen Homer beystimmiges Werk, von William Mure: Critical History &c., London, 1850. Diese Schrift hat der Verfasser eingesehen, aber zu ihrer Benutzung keine Veranlassung gefunden. Fast nur summarische Urtheile begegnen beiden Streitpunkten, und von Eingehen in die Nationale Betrachtung findet sich auch bey Mure nichts. Was dieser dagegen über die Erweisungen des individuellen Dichtergenius, oder die Homerische Kunst bemerkt, hoffe ich genauer charakterisirt zu haben. Kann doch auch gewiss, keine Prüfung der fortschreitenden Poesie wahrhaft achtsam gewesen seyn, welche von Diaskeue nur die Möglichkeit zugiebt, und über diese Alterationen durch den rhapsodischen Vortrag sich so zweifelmüthig äussert wie Mure diess thut."— Vorwort, p. v.

[2] Sometimes almost to the letter, as we could show by a collation of individual passages if necessary.

It may not be superfluous here to remark, that Prof. Nitzsch's attention was called to this work very shortly after its publication, in the spring of 1850, by a request on the part of a common friend, that he would review it for a German periodical with which that friend was connected. This request, as may be supposed under the circumstances, was not complied with.

appear spontaneous, rather than a concession to the arguments of, we believe, the only modern writer by whom the opinion to which he is now a convert, had been vindicated in a detailed and comprehensive form.

With the exception accordingly of the short paragraph of his preface here in question, explaining or affecting to explain the reasons for his contempt of our volumes, neither they nor their author have been mentioned, throughout Professor Nitzsch's 680 densely printed pages of diffuse commentary on the most threadbare subtleties of the Homeric controversy, and amid copious citations of the legion of other critics of every degree of importance or insignificance, who have taken part in it from the time of Wolf down to the present day.

Professor Nitzsch assigns as his first reason for considering our labours unworthy of his attention, that we have not entered into the "national consideration" of the Homeric question. We have some difficulty in apprehending the precise import of this mysterious phrase, and in particular, whether it alludes to the poet's Greek nationality, or to his German nationality. We have been the more at a loss, from observing that a like censure has been pronounced on Hermann, Lachmann, and other eminent scholars of his own country, whose Homeric nationality of both kinds is certainly more akin to his own than to ours. It is some consolation at least, in being subjected to so harsh a censure, to reflect that we have such distinguished companions in misfortune.

A second reason for his declining any particular notice of our opinions is: that "in so far as regards the illustration of Homer's genius and poetical art, he believes that he has himself treated that part of

the subject in a more satisfactory manner than we have." Nothing can be more natural! It is possible however that other, less partial arbiters, may not be quite so indulgent towards a writer who, after having during many years maintained that the Iliad and Odyssey were not by the same poet, — after having expatiated in volumes of subtle disquisition on the diversity of character in the two works, in composition and style, in historical, geographical, and mythological facts and allusions, in moral and religious doctrine, in notices of manners and customs, in language and dialect, as evidence of difference of age, — who after all this changes his mind, asserts both poems to be by the same author, and even speaks with a sneer (p. 412.) of the originators and supporters of his own former doctrine! It is possible we repeat, that with these antecedents of Professor Nitzsch before their eyes, less partial judges of his own genius, may question his being quite so accurate a judge of the genius of Homer as he himself imagines.

Professor Nitzsch, in the third place, gives the finishing blow to the author's pretensions to rank as a Homeric critic, by denying all competency for that office, to any one who expresses himself so doubtfully regarding what he calls, in the pedantic jargon of his own school, the Diaskeuë; or, in other words, regarding the interpolations or corruptions, to which the original text of the poet has been subjected by the early reciters and editors.

It is not true that we have expressed ourselves the least doubtfully on that subject. Nothing can be more explicit than the terms in which we have, on numerous occasions, admitted the existence of such blemishes. Our expressions of doubt refer solely to the

pretensions advanced, by rash and hypercritical commentators, to infallibility in their detection. It is true that, in regard to such questions, we have at all times been guided by the spirit of caution and forbearance so worthless in the estimation of Professor Nitzsch; but the absence of which has always appeared to us the ruling defect of the school to which he belongs, and the main obstacle to any practical good resulting from its labours. We have never, we readily admit, arrogated to ourselves the privilege of discarding at will as nongenuine, all those passages of either poem which may happen to stand in the way of some favourite theory or fancy of our own. For such is the true definition of the practice, which Professor Nitzsch considers so indispensable to success in Homeric criticism. No impartial student of the commentaries of Wolf or Heyne, of Hermann or Lachmann, of Payne Knight or Nitzsch,—advocates respectively of the Pisistratian system, the Digamma system, the Patchwork system, the Separatist system, or any other of the numerous modifications of conjecture or paradox, which have bewildered the German brain during the last sixty years,—can fail to perceive, that the dissecting knife of each successive experimentalist, has been directed with scrupulous accuracy to those parts of the Homeric body, on which it was necessary for the sake of his own particular theory to operate, whether in the mode of amputation or otherwise. If these celebrated masters who, however widely at issue on other points, are united in zeal for the mutilation of the poems, could have held a council-general, or congress, on the subject of "Diaskeuë," and have arrived at some tangible conclusion, as to the precise extent to which the existing

text was to be cut up or pared down, even more merciful critics might have been disposed to pay deference to their verdict. But when we find one summarily rejecting what another as confidently retains; a third condemning and ridiculing what a fourth vindicates and admires; when we find each dashing out with his pen (like the passing dilettante with his brush, in the familiar story of the picture exposed to wayfaring criticism) the to him objectionable passages, until the whole becomes an undistinguishable mass of blots and scratches, can any reasonable man look on such proceedings as based on common sense or sound criticism? In the text of this same volume of Professor Nitzsch where we are taunted for our over caution, Hermann and Lachmann, who have carried the work of destruction somewhat further than himself, are smartly attacked for their extravagance, and their views are denounced as "unintelligible," and "impossible," and "idle talk," &c. Hermann and Lachmann again, while each rejecting a great part, it may better be said the whole of the Iliad, as spurious, differ widely as to the mode in which the shreds and patches of Hexameter verse that result from their labours, are to be distributed among the legion of epic ballad-singers whom they have conjured into existence for behoof of their theories. In one thing however they cordially agree, and that is, in regarding Nitzsch's comparative moderation with as great scorn, as he does our disinclination to mix ourselves up in what appears to us a most unprofitable dispute.

It would seem however, that Professor Nitzsch's notion of a competent Homeric critic, in regard to this all important subject of "the Diaskeuë," is, not that he should agree with Professor Nitzsch as

to what are the spurious parts of the Iliad and Odyssey, but that he should be prepared at least to discard large portions of their text as spurious; no matter whether the same as, or different from, the portions so discarded by Professor Nitzsch himself. The only parallel case that occurs to us is in the old French farce of the Frères féroces; where the candidate for admission into a company of freebooters, is required to bring evidence that he has robbed or murdered a certain number of travellers, no matter whether that number should consist, in whole or in part, of near friends and relatives of other members of the band.

But the crowning proof of the rottenness of this system, as regards at least Professor Nitzsch's application of it, is to be found in the fact, that after having, some twenty years ago, in the exercise of this heaven-born faculty (Divination, as he himself defines it) of discerning sameness or diversity in epic authorship, proved, to his own satisfaction at least, in a voluminous treatise, that the Iliad and Odyssey were by different poets,—he now, in a still more ponderous dissertation, rejects his former doctrine and arguments as false or fallacious, and maintains in a most authoritative tone, the very opinions which he formerly condemned and controverted. We have no wish to be severe on so valuable a convert to views, the establishment of which we have so greatly at heart. In justice to ourselves however, we must appeal to the impartial public, whether our method be not, of the two, the one best justified by its practical results. The "National consideration" by which we have been guided, and our mode of dealing with the doubtful portions of the text, have led us, from the

commencement of our Homeric researches, to the steady maintenance of truths, to which the "National consideration" of Professor Nitzsch, and his intuitive perception of "Diaskeuë," have blinded him during the best years of his life. The question at issue really lies between rashness and recantation on the one hand, and caution and consistency on the other.

Nor must it be overlooked, that Professor Nitzsch's abandonment of his wider range of Separatist heresy, has brought in its train a like abjuration of several subordinate points of heterodoxy, to which he till lately subscribed. Omega of the Iliad for example, formerly condemned by him, has now, also mainly on grounds anticipated in our pages, been admitted to its just Homeric rights, and place in the original poem. Let us hope that he may yet live to produce, after another interval of twenty years, another volume of some 700 pages, in which other portions of either poem, such as the eighth book of the Odyssey or the tenth of the Iliad may, on the same infallible authority, be relieved from the stigma of illegitimacy which, for the present, it is still his pleasure should attach to them.[1]

The wonderful part of the matter is, that an

[1] We may take this opportunity of noticing an additional argument in favour of the original connexion of the tenth book with the rest of the poem, which has been communicated to us by an ingenious correspondent, the Rev. Mr. Blake of Stobo, too late unfortunately to be available in the part of our text on which it properly bears. In the first nine books of the poem, there is no allusion to any special military connexion or comradeship between Ulysses and Diomed. The subject of the tenth book hinges essentially on the formation of that comradeship. In the ensuing battle accordingly, of the eleventh book, these two heroes are found (v. 312. sqq.), still conjointly and in partnership, stemming the adverse tide of war.

The same ingenious communication also, in a series of illustrative details which we should gladly see in type, places in a striking light the poetical value, or even necessity, (more briefly alluded to in this volume p. 265.

author who has committed himself to so marvellous an extent, in the application of a favourite method of criticism in the gross, should still continue gravely to boast of the excellence of that method, and of his own peculiar skill in its management in detail. After having been so widely at fault in regard to two entire poems, he not only invites us to repose implicit confidence in his gift of inspiration, when brought to bear on individual passages of their text, but exultingly contrasts the rash spirit of adventure to which he owes the disasters of his previous voyage, with the caution and forbearance that have guided others in safety through the same dangerous course of navigation.

Of all qualifications for an office, the meanest is one which every body possesses. It would have been quite as easy for us as for Professor Nitzsch, to discard on all occasions as interpolations, such portions of either poem as did not happen to square with our own views. We might also, if ambitious of distinction in so questionable an arena of polemical gymnastics, have amused ourselves and wearied our readers, as he habitually does, by diffuse speculations on the nongenuine character of this or that verse or passage. Our reasons for avoiding, in as far as possible, such pedantic discussions, have been explained in several parts of this history, to the satisfaction we believe of that portion of our readers who unite common sense to the other qualifications of competent critics. And it would have been more to the purpose, and to his own credit, had Professor Nitzsch

sq.) of the tenth book, with its brilliant and cheering exploits, to account for the change of feeling in the army between the ninth and eleventh books, from despondency at the close of the one, to cheerful hope and confidence at the commencement of the other.

fairly met and combated those reasons, instead of indulging in supercilious taunts at our forbearance, such as could hardly fail to recoil upon himself.

In objecting however, to the manner in which he has abjured his late errors, we, in common with every true admirer of Homer, hail the fact of his conversion with sincere pleasure. We should be doing injustice to Professor Nitzsch, were we not to admit, that his elaborate support of the Separatist theory, and the influence of his casuistical arguments in blinding the eyes of less critical students to its fallacy, had placed him, for some time past, in the position of chief bulwark or champion of the old Wolfian heresy in the land of its birth. The other more licentious modifications of that heresy, which we have characterised above as the Patchwork and Pisistratian systems, and which he himself combats under the collective definition of the Littlelay theory, had long proved more than a surfeit, even to the proverbially capacious German appetite for literary paradox. In regard to them, a new generation had arisen which knew not Wolf or Heyne. The efforts even of such veteran giants in polemical casuistry as Hermann and Lachmann, were found insufficient to stem the tide of returning common sense; nor, on their late removal from the scene, does their mantle appear to have fallen on any worthy successor. Professor Nitzsch's surrender of the remaining stronghold of error, with the defence of which he had specially charged himself, will, it is hoped, form the closing act of a controversy, so little credible to the taste or the judgement of the present enlightened age.

Caldwell, Oct. 1854.

ADVERTISEMENT TO THE FIRST EDITION.

As the first Book of this History is in itself of a more or less introductory nature, it has been thought advisable to avoid any undue accumulation of preliminary matter, by comprising in the opening chapter the greater part of those observations which would, in ordinary cases, be embodied in the preface to a work of this description. The remarks here subjoined relate merely to the arrangement of certain subordinate details of the text.

In the citation of authorities, it has been the Author's object to preserve a middle course, between that meagreness which presumes a degree of confidence in his own accuracy, such as he has no right to expect on the part of the reader, and that profusion of references, which tends rather to bewilder than to assist the student, in attempting to form his own judgement by an appeal to original sources. As a general rule, the vouchers for each fact or opinion have been limited to the text of one or two standard authors; reference being frequently made at the same time, for the benefit of those who may desire a more copious array of authorities, to other modern works in which they have been given in greater abundance. Occasionally however, where importance might seem to attach to the number as well as the value of the testimonies on any particular point, they have been quoted at greater detail on the margin of the Author's own page.

The antient classics have usually been cited according to the books, chapters, or other similar subdivisions of their text. In the case however of some, especially the more voluminous of those authors, such as Plato, Strabo, Plutarch, the references, in

conformity with what is still in these instances the usual practice, have frequently been made to the pages of the earlier standard editions. The numbers of those pages, as the critical student is aware, have been, as a general rule, noted by subsequent editors opposite to the corresponding subdivisions of the text, on the side margin of the pages of their own editions. In the citation of the Attic dramatists and of Pindar, poets whose metrical forms have afforded scope for much variety of arrangement to modern editors, the references are made to the text of the Leipzig Pocket Classics (Tauchnitz), unless where it is otherwise stated in the citation itself.[1] It could hardly happen but that, in the numerical details of so large a body of references, errors would occasionally find place. Every passage quoted has, however, been carefully verified in the original work; even therefore should the citation itself be at fault, the text appealed to will not be difficult to find, by aid of the copious indices with which editions of the classics are usually provided.

The Author cannot rate too highly his obligations to the zeal and industry of those, chiefly German, philologers, whose valuable collections of "Fragments," have done so much of late to mitigate the calamity sustained by the modern public, in the loss of the entire works which have supplied material for the labours of these meritorious scholars. Without the aid of their collections, the composition of several of the Author's own chapters, offering, as they do, a reconstruction as much as a history of the works to which they are devoted, would scarcely have been practicable. The most complete repertory of the fragments of epic literature treated in the second Book, especially of the Cyclic poems, and of those comprised under the

[1] In regard to Diogenes Laertius, an author very frequently quoted in parts of this history, it may be proper to remark, that, in the first two volumes, his text has been cited according to the chapters and sections of the edition of Tauchnitz; in the last volume, according to the paragraphs of the older editions.

title of Miscellaneous epic poems, is that of Düntzer. The occasional errors of its text have been checked, or its deficiencies made good, by the compilation embodied in Clinton's Fasti Hellenici; by that of Marckscheffel, for Eumelus, Cinæthon, and the Naupactica; by those of Müller and Wüllner for the Epic cycle; and by that of Leutsch for the Thebaïs. The best collection of the Fragments of Hesiod is that appended to the same work of Marckscheffel; a work containing a large mass both of valuable information and of sound criticism, on the various subjects of which it treats. The citation consequently of the Fragments of "Hesiod," and of the other poets in the compilation of Marckscheffel, will be made according to the numbers of his arrangement; in the citations of the Cyclic poems, and of the Miscellaneous epic poems, the numbers will be understood to be those of Düntzer; unless where, in either case, a different collection is named.

In respect to the Lyric poets, the compilations of Gaisford, Schneidewin, and Bergk, with the separate publications of Welcker, Liebel, Kleine, Matthiæ, Neue, and Bach [1], devoted to the remains of Alcman, Archilochus, Stesichorus, Alcæus, Sappho, and other authors of this period, leave probably little to desire or to hope, short of the discovery of the entire compositions of these illustrious poets. In the chapters devoted to their lives and works, the particular collection preferred as the standard text-book in each individual case will be specified.

In order to avoid that interruption of the just continuity of historical narrative, which would result from an accumulation, either in the body of the work or in the marginal notes, of the many illustrative or controversial details which are more or less indispensable to the full treatment of a subject of this nature,

[1] [To this list may now be added the Lyra Græca of Mr. J. Donaldson, (Edinb. 1854); which, as a selection, with its biographical notices and commentary, forms a valuable compendium for the young student.]

the Author has preferred annexing the greater portion of such matter in the form of Appendices to his volumes.

In the quotations of specimen passages from the lyric poets, translations of the texts quoted have been subjoined. This has been done with the hope, in which the Author cannot venture to feel very sanguine, of securing, even among non-Hellenist readers, some small addition to the very slender share of publicity or popularity now enjoyed by what is, beyond all comparison, the most brilliant period of Grecian or of European lyric poetry. In the quotations from the Iliad and Odyssey on the other hand, the Greek text alone has been given. It could hardly, under any circumstances, have been proper or necessary to supply the reader with versions of passages cited from poems so universally familiar, through the medium of classical modern translations, to all well-educated persons. Nor, in the present case, would the peculiar kind of illustration which the Author had in view, in his often copious extracts from those poems, have been in any great degree promoted by an equally copious supply of English versions.

In his translations from the Lyric poets, he has done his best to embody the letter as well as the spirit of the original. Where however, as sometimes happened, it did not appear that these two objects could be combined, he has considered it more desirable to attempt, by a free paraphrase, to convey to the mind of the reader unversed in the original tongue, a real impression of the genius of the passage and of its author, than by a rigid adherence to turns of Greek idiomatic thought or phraseology, to run the risk of rendering what is spirited and expressive in the one language, pointless or unintelligible in the other.

February 20th, 1850.

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

PREFACE - - - - - - - - Page v
ADVERTISEMENT TO THE FIRST EDITION - - - xv

BOOK I.

INTRODUCTION. — MYTHICAL PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

PLAN AND PROPOSED EXTENT OF THE WORK.

1. History of literature neglected as a branch of popular composition. — 2. Advantages of its better cultivation. — 3. Eras or periods of Grecian literature. Just limits of the subject. — 4. Characteristics of its earlier stages. "Homeric question." Poetical period - - Page 1

CHAP. II.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF GREEK MYTHICAL LEGEND.

1. Distinctive characteristics of mythology and of history. — 2. Greek mythical legend, how far founded on fact. Arguments on the affirmative side. — 3. Analogy of authentic history. — 4. Arguments on the negative side. Hero worship. — 5. Human apotheosis peculiar to Græco-Pelasgic superstition. — 6. Bearings of the custom on the present question. — 7. Homer's cycle of heroic legend. — 8. Eponyme heroes. Mythical chronology - - - - - - 14

CHAP. III.

PRIMEVAL HISTORY OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. Origin and affinities of the Greek nation and language. Pelasgians. —2. Helli, Hellas, and Hellenes. — 3. Hellene, as a common title of

the Greek nation, later than the Dorian conquest.—4. Greek tribes specially claiming a Pelasgic origin in later times.—5. Relation between the Pelasgic and Hellenic tongues.—6. Views of Herodotus.—7. Their vagueness.—8. Pelasgians of Italy. Græci.—9. Macedonia. Asia Minor. Islands - - - - - Page 36

CHAP. IV.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE ON THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. Legends of Egyptian and Phœnician settlement in Greece.—2. Philological objections to the Egyptian legend.—3. Historical objections.—4. Greek prejudices concerning Egypt.—5. Phœnician legend. Historical and philological evidences in its favour.—6. The Phœnician alphabet.—7. Its adoption by the Greeks.—8. Modifications it underwent. Vowels.—9. Error of the popular doctrine on the subject. Greek numerals. Modes of writing - - - - 65

CHAP. V.

STRUCTURE AND GENIUS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. Influence of soil, climate, and national character on language.—2. Principle of formation common to the Indo-Teutonic tongues.—3. Contrast of the Semitic and Chinese.—4. Characteristic properties of the Greek branch of the Indo-Teutonic stem - - - 89

CHAP. VI.

EARLY CULTURE OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. Social condition of Greece during the heroic age. Its influence on the language.—2. Pelopidan era.—3. Æolian colonies. Dorian conquest. Ionian colonies. Subsequent distinction of dialects.—4. Their respective characteristics.—5. Pervading influence of the Homeric dialect.—6. The literary culture of the separate dialects, a peculiarity of the Greek language.—7. Appropriation of different dialects to different styles of composition.—8. Artificial formation of new dialects for new styles.—9. Ultimate ascendancy of the Attic dialect. Sicilian Doric - - - - - - 102

CHAP. VII.

ORIGINAL GENIUS OF GRECIAN LITERATURE.

1. Unity of genius between the Greek nation and its language.—2. Essential difference in the origin of Hellenic and of modern literary

culture. — 3. Advantages on the side of the Greeks. — 4. Originality and fertility of Greek inventive genius. — 5. Fundamental principles of ideal excellence in Greek composition. — 6. Classical and Romantic schools of modern composition. — 7. Superior extent and variety of modern literary culture - - - - Page 127

CHAP. VIII.

MYTHICAL POETS AND WORKS.

1. Origin and early cultivation of the art of poetry. — 2. Thrace and Thracians of the mythical age. Pieria. Daulia. Helicon. Nysa. — 3. Legendary minstrels. Amphion. — 4. Orpheus. Philammon. Thamyris. — 5. Eumolpus. Musæus. Pamphos. Linus. — 6. Olen. Olympus. — 7. Fabulous minstrelsy of Greece chiefly connected with the rites of Demeter and Dionysus. Early ascendancy of Æolian genius. Accredited works of the mythical period - - 145

BOOK II.

POETICAL PERIOD. — EPIC POETRY.

CHAP. I.

INTRODUCTION.

1. Characteristics of the poetical period. Epic and Lyric styles alone cultivated. — 2. Their definition and origin. — 3. Works comprised under each head. — 4. Proposed mode of treatment - - 168

CHAP. II.

HOMER. ILIAD AND ODYSSEY. HISTORY OF THE POEMS.

1. Homer, Hesiod, and the Cyclic poets. Miscellaneous Epic poems. — 2. Origin and Definition of the Homeric epopee. — 3. Earliest notices of the Iliad and Odyssey: Hesiod, Chest of Cypselus, Archilochus, Tyrtæus, Homeridæ, Xenophanes. — 4. Public recital, or rhapsodism. — 5. Early variations or corruptions of the text. Efforts to check or correct them. "Civic editions." Antimachus. Aristotle. — 6. Alexandrian grammarians and their editions. — 7. "Chorizontes" or Separatists. Crates. School of Pergamus. Division of the text into books. Later grammarians. — 8. Modern history of the poems. Vico. Wolf. — 9. Subsequent vicissitudes of the Homeric question - - 176

CHAP. III.

HOMER. ORIGIN OF THE POEMS. HISTORICAL DATA.

1. Authorities concerning Pisistratus and his compilation. — 2. Varieties of theory on the subject. — 3. Silence of the earlier classics. Argument from the Cyclic poems. — 4. What were the poems of "Homer" "collected and arranged" by Pisistratus. — 5. Just estimate of his Homeric labours - - - - - Page 203

CHAP. IV.

HOMER. ORIGIN OF THE POEMS. INTERNAL DATA.

1. Present state of the Homeric question.—2. Internal evidence of two kinds. Bearings of each on the case of Homer. — 3. Analysis of the poems. General rules for its guidance. — 4. Similarity and discrepancy of style; their relative value as sources of internal evidence. — 5. Consistency in the poet's portraiture of character. — 6. State of society which produced the poems. — 7. Antiquity of the Homeric epopee. Ilii persis of Demodocus. — 8. Subdivision of the following analysis - - - - - - - - 220

CHAP. V.

HOMER. ILIAD. CONCORDANCE OF THE TEXT.

1. Analytical epitome of the text. — 2. "Aristea of Diomed." — 3. Secession of Achilles. Construction of the rampart. Jove's interdict against divine interference. — 4. First and last books; Parallel of. — 5. Second book, or Catalogue. — 6. Tenth book, or Dolonea - 241

CHAP. VI.

HOMER. ILIAD. UNITY OF THE ACTION.

1. Principle of poetical unity as exemplified in the Iliad. — 2. Simplicity of the plot, and of its range of characters — 3. Character of Achilles the main poetical feature of the work. — 4. Quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon. — 5. Course of the action during the secession of Achilles. National partialities of Homer. Obduracy of Achilles. — 6. Relaxation of his wrath. Defects and advantages of the crisis. — 7. Adaptation of the characters of Achilles and Patroclus to each other. — 8. Revulsion of feeling. Grief and remorse of Achilles. Ferocity of Achilles. — 9. Softer features of his character. Interview with Priam. — 10. Moral scope and tendency of the Iliad. — 11. Amplification of the subject. Episodes. Definition of the term. — 12. Characteristics of Homer's episodes. — 13. Contrast with those of Virgil - 268

CHAP. VII.

HOMER. CHARACTERS OF THE ILIAD.

1. Supplementary remarks on the character of Achilles.—2. His oratory. Deputation of Agamemnon.—3. Consistency in the details of Homer's delineation.—4. Character of Agamemnon.—5. His oratory. Atë.—6. Character of Diomed.—7. His oratory.—8. Character of Menelaus. Parallel of the Odyssey.—9. Character of Nestor.—10. His oratory.—11. Character of Ajax.—12. His oratory.—13. Distinctive features of Greek and of Trojan national character.—14. Character of Priam. Its defects.—15. Its virtues.—16. Character of Hector.—17. His oratory.—18. Character of Æneas.—19. Character of Hecuba. Funeral dirge of Hector.—20. Characters of Paris and Helen. Page 305

CHAP. VIII.

HOMER. ODYSSEY. CONCORDANCE OF THE TEXT.

1. Analytical epitome of the text.—2. Plan of the poem contrasted with that of the Iliad.—3. Apologue of Alcinoüs.—4. Voyage of Telemachus. Noëmon. Piræus Clytides.—5. Melanthius and Melantho The seer Theoclymenus.—6. Pervading influence of Apollo - 364

CHAP. IX.

HOMER. ODYSSEY. UNITY OF THE ACTION. CHARACTERS.

1. Comparative genius of the two poems. Tripartite distribution of the action of the Odyssey.—2. Character of Ulysses.—3. Its degradation by the later organs of Epic tradition. Its comic ingredient.—4. Voyage of Ulysses. The Ciconians. Character of the hero's comrades. The Lotophagi.—5. The Cyclops. Æolus. The Læstrygonians. Circe. The "Necromancy." The Sirens.—6. Scheria and the Phæacians. Nausicaa.—7. Alcinoüs and his court.—8. Ulysses in Ithaca.—9. Character of Telemachus.—10. His oratory.—11. Character of the suitors. Antinoüs. Eurymachus. Amphinomus. Liodes.—12. Oratory of the suitors.—13. Theoclymenus the seer. Impressive scene. The catastrophe.—14. Parallel characters of Penelope and Andromache.—15. Eumæus the swineherd. Melanthius the goatherd. Eurycleia. Melantho. Irus the beggar. Eurylochus. Menelaus. Nestor. Helen - 388

CHAP. X.

HOMER. ILIAD AND ODYSSEY. DISCORDANCES OF THE TEXT.

1. Incongruity of historical details a common feature of prolonged epic narratives.—2. Example from the Odyssey.—3. Anomaly a characteristic feature of great original genius.—4. Other sources of anomaly

in poetical works. — 5. Journey of Telemachus. Analogy of the Attic drama. — 6. Other discordances of the Odyssey. Eurylochus in the isle of Circe. — 7. Variations in the personal narrative of the disguised Ulysses. — 8. His dialogue with the Cyclops. With Eumæus. Transactions in Scheria. — 9. Return of Telemachus from Sparta. Chronology of the Odyssey. — 10. Discordances of the Iliad. Fortification of the camp. Secession of Achilles. — 11. Duel of Hector and Ajax. The Gods in Ethiopia. The sleep of Agamemnon. The arms of Patroclus - - - - - - - - Page 438

CHAP. XI.

HOMER. ILIAD AND ODYSSEY. DIVINE MECHANISM.

1. Doctrine of divine interposition in human affairs as embodied by Homer. — 2. Human personification of the divine agency. — 3. Scheme of divine management in the poems. — 4. Characters of the Deities. — 5. Agency of Apollo. Neptune. The River Gods. Vulcan. Minerva. Divine instigation to crime. — 6. Poetical defects of Homer's divine mechanism. — 7. The Gods in their relation to each other. Domestic brawls in Olympus. — 8. Divination. Dreams. Omens. — 9. Of Homer's own belief in their efficacy. His doctrine of a future state. — 10. His divine mechanism compared with that of modern poetry. — 11. His doctrine of human apotheosis. — 12. Of allegory in his divine mechanism - - - - - - 468

APPENDIX.

App. A. On a peculiarity in the treatment of Homer's text by critics of the Wolfian school - - - - - 505

App. B. On the supposed Vulgate, or Editio princeps of Homer, by Pisistratus - - - - - - - 506

App. C. Supplementary remarks on the Unity of mechanical structure in the Iliad - - - - - - 507

App. D. Supplementary remarks on the relation of the Catalogue to the rest of the poem - - - - - 508

App. E. On the Phæacians of the Odyssey; their race and country 510

App. F. On the "self-contradictions" of Virgil, Milton, Cervantes, Walter Scott, and other popular authors, as compared with those of Homer - - - - - - 512

App. G. Supplementary remark on the Chronology of the Iliad - 517

A

CRITICAL HISTORY,

&c.

BOOK I.

INTRODUCTION.—MYTHICAL PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

PLAN AND PROPOSED EXTENT OF THE WORK.

1. HISTORY OF LITERATURE NEGLECTED AS A BRANCH OF POPULAR COMPOSITION. — 2. ADVANTAGES OF ITS BETTER CULTIVATION. — 3. ERAS OR PERIODS OF GRECIAN LITERATURE. JUST LIMITS OF THE SUBJECT. — 4. CHARACTERISTICS OF ITS EARLIER STAGES. "HOMERIC QUESTION." POETICAL PERIOD.

1. A PROMINENT feature of distinction between the early more genial stages of literary culture, and those of its maturity or decay, is the tendency of the human mind, in the former periods to produce for itself, in the latter to speculate on the works of others. This remark may indeed only appear strictly applicable to a state of society in which the origin and early progress of intellectual pursuit can be traced to the spontaneous efforts of native genius. The case is somewhat different where the first advances in the arts of civilised life have been made under the guidance of foreign or antient models. Hence among the nations of modern Europe, whose civilisation is founded on the ruins of

that of classical antiquity, scholastic or grammatical science has invariably preceded or accompanied the rise of taste for original composition. Even here, however, in regard to the properly national department of letters, the principle involved in the distinction above drawn will be found to hold good. Whatever zeal may have been displayed during our own middle ages by the learned men of Italy, France, or England, as commentators of the antient classics, it was not until the art of composition in the native languages of those countries had reached a certain stage of maturity, that the productions of their native authors supplied any field for the labours of professional grammarians.

In Greece, the fountain head of all European culture, no such causes intervened to obstruct or derange the natural course of events. Her literature was, in all its branches, a plant of indigenous growth, indebted to no foreign aid for its nurture or improvement. Its noblest monuments emanate from a period long prior to the existence of scientific grammar or criticism; the rise of which arts as a distinct order of pursuit, in the Alexandrian schools, was simultaneous with the decline or extinction of creative genius.

History of literature neglected as a branch of popular composition.

Upon the same principle may partly be explained, how, among the various branches of historical literature, one of the last to be cultivated should be the history of literature itself. This may, indeed, be considered as in some degree the necessary, as well as the natural, course of things. As events must have happened before they can be recorded, so works must have been written, and the art of composing them carried to some degree of perfection, before its

vicissitudes can become a subject of curious investigation. The indifference, however, which many nations have shown to a department of letters so attractive in itself, and so valuable in its results, can but partially be explained by any such cause. Literary history may, in truth, be ranked not only among the last, but the least cultivated branches of composition, both in antient and modern times. That the Greeks themselves should have shown so great an indifference to its value appears the more remarkable, when we consider the infinite number of channels in which, during their latter days, their over-exuberant genius found vent, and the voluminous library of works which it produced in the kindred class of subjects. Yet, among their legion of commentators and grammarians, there is no record of a historian of literature in the wider sense. Similar was the case with the Romans. It was hardly, indeed, to be expected, that a people so dependant for their progress in art and science on the models supplied by the Greeks, should open up for themselves any broad path of learned pursuit not previously trodden by their masters Nor, on turning to our own commonwealth of letters, will it be found that this branch of composition, though not so entirely overlooked, has received the attention due to its claims. The literature of most European nations, that of our own country for example, has long since arrived at a stage which offers materials sufficiently varied and extensive for a great historical undertaking ; yet we possess no complete national work of this description, and few other countries can boast of one entitled to the rank which it ought to possess in a national library.

In regard to modern languages, the apparent anomaly may admit, in so far, of explanation or apology, that it is but as yesterday that, in comparison with those of classical antiquity, even the earliest cultivated among the former has furnished an adequate subject for enlarged historical treatment. Long before our own course of intellectual activity commenced, that of the Greeks had terminated; and their whole rich and valuable, though imperfect, bequest of literary materials has now been for centuries in the hands of the modern public. Considering, therefore, the large share of general attention which the monuments of Hellenic genius have attracted ever since the revival of learning in Europe; how dependant our own progress has been on the models which they supply; and the extraordinary amount of labour which has been and continues to be bestowed, often, it might almost be said, wasted, on the subordinate departments of speculative archæology; it may appear even still more surprising that no complete history of Grecian literature should have been produced in any modern tongue, than that the Greeks themselves should have failed to bequeath one.

Advantages of its better cultivation.

2. It were foreign to the present object, to speculate on the causes of this want of labourers in so fair and fertile a field. The advantages, however, derivable from its better cultivation are numerous and obvious. Every one must perceive how greatly the power of appreciating a work depends on a familiarity with the spirit, not only of the age which produced it, but of that which preceded or followed; on an insight into the habits of the author, the circumstances in which he composed, the models he studied, or the school to which he belonged. The investigation of

these points is the province of the literary historian. Nor must we overlook the value of his more limited branch of the art, in its bearings on the wider province of civil history. If an accurate knowledge of the political state of any period be requisite in order to appreciate its polite learning, no less essential is a familiarity with its classical productions to a just estimate of the course or causes of political events. It is true that literature reflects, but it is equally true that it always influences, and often regulates, the moral and political destinies of nations. Even admitting, however, that the literary department of history may not be the most practically useful, it is not, or ought not certainly to be, the least attractive. The aspect under which the political annals of society exhibit human character is often most offensive, tending to lower rather than to raise the estimate of our species. How often are the greatest events brought about by worthless or insignificant agents, or perhaps, to all appearance, the result of accident. How often will the exercise of a very ordinary capacity, combined with vice and selfishness, be seen triumphing, by the mere favour of circumstances, over the best-directed efforts of virtue and patriotism. The task of the literary historian, on the other hand, is to portray humanity solely or chiefly under its amiable and ornamental features. The proper materials with which he has to deal are wit and genius. Dulness and mediocrity are, by the fundamental rules of his art, debarred from honourable distinction; and if vice be admitted to a share, it is only when accompanied by the fascinations of genius or learning.

The present work has been undertaken with the hope of supplying the existing void in our national

library, in respect to that period of European culture which has furnished the standards of taste and models of excellence to all succeeding ages.

Æras or periods of Grecian literature.

3. The literature of Greece classes itself almost spontaneously under six heads or periods, offering to the historian an equally apt arrangement of his subject.

I. The first, or Mythical period, comprises the origin and early culture of the nation and its language, with the legendary notices of those fabulous heroes and sages, to whom popular belief ascribed the first advances in elegant art or science, but of whose existence or influence no authentic monuments have been preserved.

II. The second, or Poetical period, extends from the epoch of the earliest authenticated productions of Greek poetical genius, through those ages in which poetry continued to be the only cultivated branch of composition, and terminates about the fifty-fourth Olympiad (B.C. 560).

III. The third, or Attic period, commences with the rise of the Attic drama and of prose literature, and closes with the establishment of the Macedonian ascendancy, and the consequent extinction of republican freedom in Greece.

IV. The fourth, or Alexandrian period, may be dated from the foundation of Alexandria, and ends with the fall of the Græco-Egyptian empire.

V. The fifth, or Roman period, succeeds, and extends to the foundation of Constantinople.

VI. The sixth, or Byzantine period, comprises the remaining ages of the decay and corruption of ancient civilisation, until the final extinction of the classical Greek as a living language.

The strict order of this arrangement has only been infringed in the following pages in so far as certain heads of subject, though properly belonging to one period, might comprehend matter connected with, or common to, others. The inquiry, for example, into the Original genius of the Greek language and of Grecian literature, while embodying much of what may seem to appertain to later stages of their history, has been connected with the first, or Mythical period. It offers a general summary of the principles on which the whole subject will be treated; and, as proceeding upon data more or less familiar to the classical scholar, can hardly be said to anticipate the results of subsequent investigation.

Just limits of the subject.

That the author should be destined to complete his undertaking upon the extended plan above laid down is what the most sanguine anticipations of long life, health, leisure, or other requisites for the task, can hardly entitle him to hope. It may here, however, be proper to obviate a misapprehension apt to arise as to the scope and limits of any such work, and calculated to convey a still more serious impression of its extent or difficulty than the reality justifies. The literature of Greece comprehends, no doubt, in the wider sense, her philosophy and science, as well as her poetry, history, and drama. A place consequently belongs, among her authors, to Hippocrates and Euclid, as well as to Homer and Herodotus. The authors and works, however, of the former class supply subject for the history of science rather than of letters. Their value consists chiefly, if not solely, in the depth and soundness of their speculative doctrines, upon which the mere literary censor is under but little obligation to pronounce judgment.

Those peculiarities of composition or style, which in the more popular branches of writing are the chief objects of critical animadversion, here assume a secondary importance. Hence, by the received courtesy in such cases, the historian of literature, if not altogether free from the obligation to admit such works among his materials, is, at the most, bound to devote to them but a limited share of attention.

Characteristics of its earlier stages.

4. But, even with this restriction, the subject is one of formidable extent, and encumbered with difficulties, the nature of which can be rightly appreciated by those alone who have ventured closely to grapple with them. All inquiry into the history of a language must be based on a previous acquaintance with that of the people by whom it is spoken. In our own state of society, where the political vicissitudes of each nation, from the period of its first settlement in its present seats, are matter of comparative notoriety, the historian finds this primary head of investigation already so far prepared to his hand, as to coalesce easily with the general course of his subject. In primeval Greece it is involved in deep obscurity, and an apparently inextricable maze of controversy. That fabulous uncertainty in which the remote annals of every people are more or less enveloped, here assumes the form of the most complicated system of figurative mythology ever devised by the liveliest fancy or the most subtle ingenuity. Nor in the case of the Greeks, as in that of most other nations, is this darkness confined to their barbarous ages. It extends over a period in which they had already made great advances, not only in all the elementary arts of life, but in the refinement of their language and in elegant composition. The obscurity

may even be said to increase, rather than diminish, as we enter upon that ostensibly more real and practical age, when individual works and authors present themselves in tangible forms to the contemplation. In the modern republic of letters, the appearance of those great masters whose creations form in after times the standards of excellence, coincides with a forward stage of civilisation and well-defined epochs of history. In Greece, not only the period at which they flourished, the place of their birth, and the circumstances of their lives, are unknown, but their very existence has been called in question. In the present age, more especially, the energies of many eminent critics have been exhausted in attempts to prove their individual personality to be illusive, and the supposed monuments of their genius but elaborate specimens of the book-making artifice of a comparatively recent period.

Another question of vital importance in the history not only of Greek but of universal literature, is that relative to the introduction and early use of alphabetic writing. Of this branch of inquiry it may be said as of those above noticed, that in proportion as it is simple and easily dispatched in the annals of modern culture, it is here obscure and enigmatical. It has, with the last and present generation of scholars, been commonly embraced under the single head familiarly called "the Homeric question." That arrangement, however, will here, for reasons to be assigned in their proper place, be set aside, and to each subject will be allotted its own separate share of attention.

Homeric question.

On turning to the Homeric question itself, in the more restricted sense, when we consider the learning,

ingenuity, and voluminous nature of the works devoted to its treatment during the last half-century, all, it might seem, that could now be required of the general historian were, according to the usual practice in such cases, to condense the materials at his disposal into a few concise and comprehensive chapters. With every respect, however, for the zeal and ability of those researches, we have found them still far from supplying even the elementary data for a final adjustment of the more delicate points at issue. In regard especially to one, and that the most important head of the whole subject, the internal evidence of the poems, despite the universal admission that from this source solely or chiefly can we hope for any real light on the obscurities of their history, we look in vain for any analysis of their text upon such enlarged and impartial principles as alone can insure distinct historical results. Every step, indeed, in the progress of our own investigations, by the deeper insight afforded into the beauties, the peculiarities, even the blemishes, which reflect the entire genius of "Homer," has tended more and more to the conviction that, if they have ever been fully appreciated, they have not hitherto been critically analysed or illustrated as they deserve, for the benefit of those who may themselves have less leisure or industry for such an undertaking. The analysis[1], therefore, of the Iliad and Odyssey, which will occupy so large a portion of the second book of this work, seemed, even apart from its bearings on controversial points,

[1] Its necessity and importance have been pointedly and eloquently enforced by Sir E. Bulwer (Athens, i. viii. 6.). Such an opinion comes with still greater authority from one of the chiefs of the popular literature of the day, than from a professional scholar.

in itself a desirable contribution to the history of literature. No one who rightly estimates the spirit which animates those poems, the principles of their structure, or the characteristic properties of their style, can fail to perceive their boundless influence on the whole subsequent destinies of elegant culture in Greece and Europe. Homer is the father, not only of all classical poetry, but of all elegant composition. The family resemblance, in its various forms and degrees, can be clearly traced through every succeeding generation down to the present day. With his own countrymen he was the undisputed fountain head of excellence: his supremacy was equally acknowledged by their Italian neighbours; and by the joint influence and authority of the two races has been extended, directly or indirectly, over the civilised world. Homer is, as it were, the heart from which the life-blood has circulated, by however intricate a maze of arteries and veins, to the most distant extremities of the entire body of polite learning. A thorough insight, therefore, into the nicer mechanism of his works, is not merely indispensable to any clear apprehension of their author's genius, or of the circumstances under which they were composed: it supplies at the same time a complete code of those elementary laws, by the observance of which the art of composition has been matured and carried to perfection, and, in so far, a test of the degree in which Homer's successors in every age may have emulated his excellence or been influenced by his example.

Poetical period.

The period comprised in the volumes now offered to the public terminates about the first dawn of that Athenian ascendancy in every branch of art and

science which constitutes, in familiar estimation, the most brilliant era of classical antiquity. Their contents may therefore appear to offer comparatively limited sources of interest to the scholar of the present day. It must be remembered, however, that the inferior celebrity now enjoyed by these early authors, as compared with their successors of the Attic period, is in no degree attributable to any inferiority of merit on the part of the former. The difference is to be sought solely or chiefly in the circumstance, that, while so many masterpieces of the Attic poets and their contemporaries have been preserved, the works of earlier date which have survived the ravages of time and barbarism amount, if we except the poems of "Homer" and "Hesiod," to little more, even in the case of the most favoured authors, than a stock of remains just sufficient, by their own excellence, to embitter our regret for the loss of the entire body to which they belonged. Yet the list of names represented by these remains comprehends, in regard more especially to the lyric branches of poetical composition, a greater number of authors for whom the excellence of their entire works procured from the native public the highest award of fame and popularity than is to be found in the whole subsequent annals of classical literature. Among these names it may suffice to mention that of Archilochus, alone, among the successors of Homer, classed by the native critics as his rival in brilliancy and variety of genius; that of Sappho, equally supreme in the tender departments of lyric song; those of Alcæus, Tyrtæus, Stesichorus. Weighed against these five names alone, those of the most illustrious lyric poets of succeeding ages, Simonides, Anacreon, even Pindar, are light in the scale.

If to these great lyric masters be added, together with Homer and Hesiod, the variety of miscellaneous poets, epic, genealogical, satirical, mystic, and didactic, of whose styles of composition several seem to have been exclusively proper to this period, it may claim to rank as one of the most fertile, as well as brilliant and original, in the annals of Grecian literature. The personal biographies also of many of these authors, of Archilochus, Tyrtæus, Alcæus, Sappho, Epimenides, and others, possess a peculiar interest, as well from the eccentric features and broad lights and shadows of human character which they exhibit, as from the vital connexion in many cases between the destinies of the men and those of their native commonwealths, or of the Hellenic nation at large.

From these various considerations, it has been an especial object with the author to exhibit both the literary and biographical features of this less familiar part of his subject in the fullest and clearest light which the existing materials for its treatment were calculated to supply.

CHAP. II.

HISTORICAL VALUE OF GREEK MYTHICAL LEGEND.

1. DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF MYTHOLOGY AND OF HISTORY.—2. GREEK MYTHICAL LEGEND, HOW FAR FOUNDED ON FACT. ARGUMENTS ON THE AFFIRMATIVE SIDE.—3. ANALOGY OF AUTHENTIC HISTORY.—4. ARGUMENTS ON THE NEGATIVE SIDE. HERO WORSHIP.—5. HUMAN APOTHEOSIS PECULIAR TO GRÆCO-PELASGIC SUPERSTITION.—6. BEARINGS OF THE CUSTOM ON THE PRESENT QUESTION.—7. HOMER'S CYCLE OF HEROIC LEGEND.—8. EPONYME HEROES. MYTHICAL CHRONOLOGY.

Distinctive characteristics of mythology and history.

1. THE history of every language is inseparable from that of the people by whom it is spoken. Nations may, indeed, be subjected to momentous revolutions without any sensible change in their mother-tongue: but a language can rarely, if ever, undergo vital alteration, unless in connexion with some parallel vicissitude of political destiny. It is in that earliest period of society to which attention is here more immediately directed, that, in the case of the Greeks, importance mainly attaches to this connexion; an importance, unfortunately, much enhanced by the obscurity in which the subject is involved. A want of classical authorities cannot, indeed, be pleaded. The difficulty lies rather in the shadowy unsubstantial nature of the copious mass at our disposal; still more, perhaps, in the variety of opinions as to the mode in which the historian may be entitled to avail himself of their aid. It becomes, therefore, in some measure necessary, before entering on any such inquiry, to offer some explanation of the principles on which it will be conducted, and of the author's views as to the nature and value of the existing data for its guidance.

That the voluminous body of popular Greek tradition, which avowedly forms the sole existing record of this primitive age, is essentially fabulous and legendary, will not be disputed by any intelligent scholar of the present day. To pronounce, however, as has been done in certain modern schools, the whole of that tradition, both in its substance and in its details, to be altogether false and visionary, appears a stretch of paradox little less extreme than that of the old sect of mythologers, who assumed the entire succession of gods and heroes to have been mortal kings, warriors, or sages, and the adventures recorded of them to present, under allegorical disguise, the real facts of primeval history. Any elaborate analysis of the comparative merits of these conflicting theories, or of the intermediate views promulgated in the wide field of controversy which they open up, were beyond the present purpose. A few general definitions will, however, be necessary, in order to explain, and it is hoped with the majority of readers, to justify, the position which has here been taken up on the debatable ground.

The mythology of any people, in the wider sense of the term, embraces the whole body of national tradition, emanating from those remote ages when the spirit of accurate inquiry was yet dormant, and artificial aids to the transmission of knowledge were unknown or imperfect. In such a state of society, both historical events and religious doctrines are communicated through the medium of the imagination rather than of the reason, in an ornamental or exaggerated form, often under the disguise of symbol or allegory.

History, on the other hand, while exclusively

occupied in recording facts, presents, or professes to present them in their substantial reality.

It is more easy, however, to apprehend the difference between mythology and history, than to distinguish where, in the annals of any people, the one terminates and the other commences. As it is the blending of truth and fiction, of the real and ideal, which forms the distinctive feature of genuine national legend, so it is in the gradual ascendancy of the one over the other, with the advance of intellectual culture, that the transition from mythology to history takes place. A purely mythical period might, perhaps, be most nearly defined: that in which the art of writing is unknown, or so little practised, that memory constitutes the sole means of transmitting knowledge. The habit of recording events in writing might, with similar propriety, be described as the characteristic of authentic history. This, however, becomes a theoretical rather than a practical distinction, where, as in the case here immediately in point, so much uncertainty exists as to the epoch when the art of writing was first introduced, or the extent to which it may have been cultivated in early times. There can also be no doubt that written records of contemporaneous events may abound at periods when the more popular and generally accredited annals are embodied in essentially mythical forms: nor is it less certain, on the other hand, that even professional prose writers of history, in semibarbarous ages, often give little more than the substance of the vulgar legends, in a more methodical perhaps, but scarcely more authentic form than the poetical authorities from whom they borrow.

That alone can be considered as a strictly historical period, in which the art of writing, and the

materials for its exercise, are universally prevalent, and the course of events, by its means, is habitually and systematically recorded. Such a state of things can first be recognised in Greece about the time of the Persian war.

In reckoning back from this fully enlightened epoch, in the history of any people, towards their remote mythical ages, or rather in reckoning from their mythical ages down to the fully enlightened era, there must occur a point where light begins to prevail over darkness; where, in the blending above described of the real and the fictitious element of tradition, the former, which in the end acquires the complete mastery, first begins to gain the ascendant. This line of distinction is perhaps more clearly marked in Greece than in most other countries, by the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus, and the ensuing final settlement of the dominant Hellenic races in the seats which they afterwards permanently occupied. The rude patriarchal polity and martial habits of the previous generations were now gradually superseded by a taste for civil rights and constitutional government; and the first gleams of authentic history appear in the more general practice of recording important events in writing. There seems, indeed, plausible ground of belief, that dates and genealogies, however meagre and imperfect, were so recorded during the whole or the greater part of this period.[1] Hence, too, may be explained why the epoch of the Dorian conquest closes the heroic age of Greece; or, in other words, why the subjects of heroic celebration have been, by a standard law of Greek poetical literature, selected exclusively from

[1] See Book III. Ch. vii. § 9.

the antecedent era. This may be attributed partly, perhaps, to the superior brilliancy of its events and achievements; chiefly, however, to the greater scope which its obscurity held out to the license of fable and poetical embellishment.

Greek mythical legend, how far founded on fact.

2. From the epoch, therefore, of the Dorian settlement down to the Persian war, Greek tradition presents, with whatever alloy of fiction, a more or less connected series of facts: beyond the former epoch, its details, at least, are altogether fabulous and poetical. Hence a wide discrepancy of opinion exists, as to the degree of credit to which they may be entitled. The old, and still the more generally received, doctrine is, that these heroic adventures, in so far as offered to us in human form or substance, embody, however vaguely, certain fundamental truths of early history. This view, however, has been repudiated in some recent schools of mythological interpretation, and all reality has been denied either to facts or persons prior to the Dorian conquest.[1] Events, it is admitted, must have happened, and heroes must have lived, before that date; "but the received traditions concerning them offer," it is maintained, "merely the shadow, not the substance, of men or things The legend of Troy, for example, is at the most but

[1] See K. O. Müller, Prolegomena zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie, and other authorities accumulated by Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. i. ch. xvi.; with his own elaborate commentary on the same subject. To most of what is urged by these authors, as to the error of the old pragmatical mode of interpretation, we readily subscribe. But the rigid line of dogmatical distinction which they would draw between history and fiction, appears no less liable to the charge of fallacy and hypercriticism. There is certainly no argument urged by them against a substratum of fact in the legend of Troy, which would not, if consistently followed out in principle, as completely disprove the existence of Charlemagne as that of Priam and Agamemnon.

a dim reflexion of the fact that early warfare existed between the tribes of the western and those of the eastern coast of the Ægæan. The vicissitudes of the contest, as worked up in the Homeric poems, are but types of human conduct or destiny; and the chiefs and heroes celebrated represent the tutelar deities worshipped by those primeval barbarous warriors."

For the better elucidation of this subtle question, recourse must be had to those first principles of human nature in which all popular tradition has its origin; and which, as operating in every state of society, and forming the foundation of all history, of all poetry, and by consequence of all literature, would here, apart from any secondary considerations, demand a certain share of attention.

The disposition to preserve the memory of past events, of the great actions of our forefathers, or of the benefits conferred by them on posterity, is a species of rational instinct forming, perhaps, the chief distinction between man in his rudest state and the brute creation. This disposition is, accordingly, found to prevail more generally, like other instincts, in a primitive than in a civilised state of society, in proportion as in the former the cares of the present are less numerous, and the imagination is more free to dwell on the past; more, consequently, among a pastoral than a commercial people, more in the peasant than in the artisan. In different nations, its influence will be found much in the scale of their mental capacities. Among the Negroes and North American Indians, races inferior in intellectual power to those of Europe and Asia, it seems to be comparatively torpid. In the Indo-Germanic family of man-

kind, especially the Greek or Pelasgie braneh of that family, it has been most powerfully implanted, and most extensively developed.

To the same source from which the legends of a simple people derive their permanenee, may be traeed the mode in which they are embodied. The same veneration for the great men of past ages which impels their descendants to celebrate their actions, also creates a disposition to exaggerate and embellish them. This tendency to exaggerate, when reduced to system, is called mythology; the tendency to embellish is ealled poetry. Not only was the subject to be ennobled, but the language to be raised above that of ordinary life, by combining eleganee and dignity of expression with the harmonious flow of metrical numbers. Metre was also required to assist the memory, and, in the absence or imperfection of other teehnical aids, to secure to these primitive attempts at historieal composition, what was in fact their original object, permanent preservation.

Arguments on the affirmative side.

If this view of the rise and genius of legendary history be correct, the advoeate of the older more popular opinion might argue that "the leading traditions of heroie Greeee, the wars of Troy and Thebes for example, fulfil the eonditions above laid down for the blending of the poetical and the real in their composition. It cannot reasonably be doubted, that martial enterprises were undertaken by primitive Peloponnesian and Thessalian chiefs, and that they fought and acted much as Agamemnon and Achilles fight and act in the Iliad: and it is at least as probable that their wars were waged in the country where Homer decribes them, as elsewhere. Nor, therefore, is it easy to see why the deseendants of

those chiefs should not have represented their actions poetically speaking, as they were performed, and called the heroes by their own names, rather than by other fictitious titles. Although, in remote periods of antiquity, pure fiction may gradually usurp the place of traditional history, the case here in question is one of those where such a change is least likely to have happened. Admitting the first commencement of authentic record to coincide with the Dorian conquest of Southern Greece, and the main facts of that revolution to be historical, it must be remembered that the generation celebrated in the Iliad is represented in the same accounts as scarcely a degree removed from that by which the same Dorian conquest was achieved. It is surely far from probable that truth should so suddenly take the place of fiction; that the heroes who figure in Greek legend should be allegorical personages up to the moment when the Dorians crossed into Peloponnesus, and should then at once be converted into real kings and warriors."

Analogy of authentic history.

3. The want of direct historical light on the legendary annals of Greece may, perhaps, in some degree be supplied by the analogy of corresponding periods in modern times, on which that light shines more clearly. In our own middle ages, lines of authentic chronicle and of fabulous tradition are frequently observed running parallel to each other, without, however, any appearance of the former exercising an influence on the latter, either in supplying its facts or correcting its fictions. If in these cases the substance of the leading events of the prose record is found universally or generally embodied under the usual mythical disguise in the poetical

legend, we have a fair ground of inference, that in other cases, where no such direct evidence exists, poetical tradition may comprise real as well as figurative matter. There can be no doubt that this correspondence between poetry and history is commonly, if not invariably, perceptible, where opportunity occurs for tracing it, in the genuine heroic legend of a people in a state of society similar to that described in the Iliad. The examples supplied by the epic minstrelsy of the modern middle ages are numerous and obvious. The poetical legends of Etzel and Dieterich, in the Teutonic, and of Beowulf, Hengst, and Horsa, in the Saxon romance; of the Cid in the Spanish; or of Chevy Chase and Otterburn in our own border chivalry, are, in their origin and essence, as little connected with authentic history in the technical sense, as are the poems of Homer. Another case, perhaps still more in point, is that of the Servian heroic songs[1], between which and the Homeric poems analogy has frequently been traced in illustration of other speculative points of Homeric criticism. To these examples might be added the ballads of primeval Rome, the mythical details of which Niebuhr, no very indulgent authority in such cases, has shown to have been worked up, from the age of Servius downwards, on the same kernel of authentic record which has supplied material for his own critical history. Had the parallel letter of monkish or pontifical chronicle, which in each of these cases establishes the connexion between fact and fable, been swept away, the element of truth in the poems would not the less remain. And does

[1] Ranke, Hist. of Servia, Mrs. Kerr's Transl. 2nd ed. p. 80. sqq.

not the law of historical analogy justify the converse of the rule? Had the Iliad been composed in an age when some barbarous chronicler, native or foreign, some Jornandes or Paulus Diaconus, had possessed the means of transmitting in doggerel prose the main facts which that poem embodies, might we not now possibly be as well satisfied of the existence of Priam and Agamemnon, as of that of Attila, the Cid [1], and Percy Hotspur?

There are also plausible grounds for assuming the basis of fact to be broader and more solid, both as to persons and events, in the Hellenic and Latin, than in the Teutonic or Scandinavian minstrelsies, to which appeal is usually made in illustration of this question by the more sceptical school of commentators.[2] The mythology where Attila, Theodoric and Beowulf figure as prominent characters, extending over a wide expanse of country and a great variety of races, afforded a corresponding scope for the corruption of pure tradition, or the license of popular fiction. The reverse was the case in Greece and Latium,

[1] The poem and hero of the Cid offer, perhaps, the nearest parallel, in some respects a very close one, to the Iliad and Achilles of Homer. The Cid is pronounced by Southey the oldest and best epic poem in the Spanish language. Its origin, like that of the Iliad, is involved in deep obscurity. Its adventures are highly mythological. Yet the real existence of its hero, and the substratum of history in its action, are beyond the reach of controversy. Conf. Ticknor, Hist. of Span. Lit. vol. I. p. 11. sqq.

[2] The romances of chivalry, to which appeal is often also preferred in the same quarters, such as Parsival, Sangreal, or Amadis de Gaule, fictions for the most part of fantastical sophists of the corrupt middle age of modern literature, can hardly claim to rank as popular legend at all, still less form a criterion for estimating that embodied in the Homeric poems. One might as reasonably adopt the Pilgrim's Progress or Gulliver's Travels as a test of the veracious element in the ballads of Chevy Chase and Otterburn.

narrow regions, with a limited population of the same race, and united by a powerful bond of national feeling. The finer taste and more accurate genius by which early Greek literature is distinguished, would also counteract the tendency to such extravagant exaggeration of facts, or substitution of persons as the parallel course of real history enables us to detect in the "romantic" cycle of epic tradition. The Iliad and Odyssey afford a striking illustration of the distinction above drawn. In spite of their copious ingredient of supernatural mechanism, and its officious interference with human freedom of action, whoever peruses those poems in an impartial spirit, must be sensible of a greater tone of reality in the portions of their narrative which profess to be real, than in any modern composition of the same nature. Allowance may also, perhaps, be made for the different state of art and civilisation. It is difficult to class the men who erected or inhabited the noble structures of Mycenæ, and who certainly preceded the Dorian conquest, in the same rank of mythical nonentity as the barbarous semidæmons who figure in Northern romance: we feel as if the existence of the former ought to have been as intimately associated with their residence, even in the popular legend, as that of the Egyptian kings with their pyramids and palaces. As further evidence of the ingredient of truth in the legend of the Trojan war, might be urged the vital connexion, in the way of cause and effect, between that event and so important a chapter in the real history of Greece as the colonisation of Asia Minor; a connexion, partly immediate, partly indirect, through the Dorian occupation of the mother-country, which latter event, in every version of

the legend, is but a few generations removed from the conquest of the Troad.[1]

To the above evidence, derived from individual cases of historical parallel, another more general argument may be added from the same source. There is scarcely a people of historical times, but can boast of some real series of heroic adventure, around which the poetical sympathies of later generations are fondly concentrated. The Christian races, as a body, look back to their crusades or sacred wars, as their common repertory of chivalrous exploit or epic celebration, with the same feelings as the Hellenes looked back to the siege of Troy. In this wider range, therefore, of common heroic adventure, as in other more local instances already quoted, the really national subjects of minstrelsy are acknowledged to rest, in our own state of society, on some solid foundation of events and characters. None, however, of the nations of modern Europe can claim to surpass, or even equal, the Hellenes, in zeal for the memory of their great men and glorious achievements. It is the more difficult therefore to believe, as the modern theory relative to the Greek heroic age assumes, that these same Hellenes should, alone among nations under similar circumstances, have bestowed their whole stock of chivalrous sympathy on an entirely fictitious set of persons and enterprises, and adopted as the basis of their history, geography, and genealogy, the events of a war which never took place, and the destinies of heroes who never existed.

4. Thus far the light of authentic history seems to Arguments

[1] See further, Book II. Ch. xviii. § 7.

on the negative side. Hero-worship.

favour the popular mode of interpretation. From the same source, however, are derived some of the most plausible arguments on the other side. "A certain amount of the supernatural may, it is said, be conceded, as the usual characteristic of all heroic legend, even when founded on fact. But upon no sound principle of historical analogy can we reconcile with a human personality those divine attributes, and that immediate descent from, and connexion with, the popular deities, which form the common privilege of the Greek heroes; still less can we explain the fact of the more distinguished among them having been themselves worshipped as gods in the national pantheon. The true explanation of these divine attributes offers itself obviously in the parallel mythology of the Teutonic romances; in which are frequently found figuring, as real kings and warriors, beings whom the subsidiary light of history proves to have been originally gods, transformed in the fable into men. The same law of historical analogy, therefore, to which appeal has just been made, warrants the inference, as to the heroes of Troy, that the divine element of their nature was the groundwork on which their human personality was afterwards engrafted." In order to test the validity of this conclusion, it will be necessary once more to revert to first principles.

The value of all historical analogy, as a means of critical illustration, must depend on a right estimate of the special circumstances by which the cases supplying the parallel may happen to be distinguished. In the present instance, for example, no appeal could properly be made to the theological element of Teutonic fable in elucidation of the Greek heroic mythology, unless on the understanding that the fundamental principles of the two systems of Paganism were

the same; or at least that no such difference existed between them as to render illogical or improbable in the one case, conclusions which might be probable or certain in the other. It happens, however, that, in respect to the peculiar feature now in question, the Hellenic system of polytheism is marked by characteristics exclusively proper to itself, and which preclude, or rather reverse, the test of analogy which it has here been proposed to derive from Teutonic romance. In order rightly to appreciate this distinction, it will be proper to take a concise view of the various elements of which the Greek pantheon is composed.

These may be divided into three classes: the first comprises the purely divine portion of the system, the ideal personifications of the Godhead and of its attributes, common in a great measure to the Greeks with other Pagan nations. These are the personages who figure as the great gods or royal family of Olympus, whose divine nature is untainted by any human alloy, and whose origin no rational interpreter has ever proposed to trace to a historical source.

To the second class belongs the inferior race of figurative abstractions, under which the lively imagination of the Greeks embodied its conceptions of the ordinary phenomena of the moral or material world. Such are the Muses, Graces, Litæ, Parcæ, and other representatives of human action, suffering, or attribute; together with the River Gods, Nymphs, Naïads, Tritons, and the rest of the subordinate train of terrestrial and marine deities.

The third class comprises the Demigods, or Heroes, the human, as distinguished from the purely cosmogonical, elements of the system. This class, according to the popular opinion, consists, in great part at least, of distinguished mortals promoted after death by an

admiring posterity to divine honours. As forming by far the most important part of the system in connexion with the present question, it must here be submitted to a somewhat closer analysis.

Human apotheosis peculiar to Græco-Pelasgic superstition.

5. The principle of human apotheosis, or, in other words, of awarding divine honours to mortals, is not only one of the most prominent characteristics of Helleno-Pelasgic superstition, but one which distinguishes it from every other antient form of Paganism. Among the Egyptians, Syrians, and other civilised nations to the eastward, unlimited as was the scope given to the representation of the Deity under human type, the promotion of mortal men to the rank of gods was altogether excluded; or, if any approach to such a thing can be recognised, it must be considered in the light of anomaly, or violation of established rule. Among the Greeks, on the other hand, the practice can be traced with singular consistency, from the earliest period of which tradition has preserved any memorial, down to the final extinction of classical heathenism. But the principle itself was too inveterate to give way even to a change of religion. It was transferred from the Temple to the Church, from the heathen to the Roman Catholic mythology, in which system the canonised saints and martyrs offer the closest analogy to the deified Pagan heroes.[1]

The most subtle casuistry can point out no generic distinction between the apotheosis of kings or great men in the historical ages of Greece and Rome, and

[1] This analogy is admitted, and aptly expressed, in the title "Divi," common to both Pagan and Roman Catholic demigods. The distinction between classical and oriental superstition, as transferred to modern times, is also observable in the strenuous repudiation by the Mahommedans of all such hero-worship, the prevalence of which in the Roman Catholic church has always supplied the Moslem divines with one of their favourite weapons of polemical argument against Christianity.

that of popular heroes in fabulous antiquity. Whatever difference may exist is to be sought, not in the spirit of the system, but in that of the times or circumstances. The identity of the system itself distinctly appears in the modifications it underwent with the vicissitudes of society. In the first place it may be observed, that, while the practice of apotheosis was common to all or most of the Græco-Pelasgic tribes, to those namely, connected in blood and language with the Hellenes, no vestige of it can be discovered in any other quarter. In Italy we find it common to the Romans, a people of kindred stock, while among the Etruscans, a nation to all appearance of radically different origin, their is no trace of it whatever. As little can it be recognised among the Germans or Celts. It is further remarkable, that, in the dark as well as the historical ages of classical Paganism, it is exemplified chiefly in monarchal, and rarely, if ever, in republican states. This is in close harmony with the law of nature to which its origin has here been traced. It is chiefly in such a state of society that individuals are enabled to acquire a degree of power or influence over their fellow-men on earth, sufficient to secure them a corresponding homage in the next world. In historical times, accordingly, the practice was carried to the greatest excess during the Roman empire; a period which, from the spread of knowledge and religious scepticism, might otherwise have been supposed least favourable to such extravagance. Other examples might be cited among the Spartans [1], who, adhering to monarchal

[1] Of Lycurgus, Herodot. I. lxvi.; Paus. III. xvi. 5.; Aristot. ap. Plut. in vit. xxxi.: of Lysander, Plut. in vit. p. 443.; conf. Hesych. et Phot. v. Ανσάνδρια: of Brasidas, Thucyd. v. xi. No such distinction was ever conferred by republican Athens on any one of her citizens.

forms, though tempered by republican institutions, prided themselves also on heroic simplicity of manners. The Macedonian monarchy offers illustrations no less to the point than those derived from imperial Rome. All these examples are marked by the same spirit. The motives which deified a Cæsar, an Alexander, a Lysander, a Lycurgus, an Agamemnon, were the same. The faith with which their divine character was admitted, or the devotion with which they were worshipped, might vary with times or manners: but the original principle of apotheosis is identical throughout.

Bearings of the custom on the present question.

6. The critic, therefore, who desires to avail himself of the light of history, in elucidating the obscurities of heroic fable, will reason as follows: During the whole period of classical antiquity on which that light clearly shines, there exists proof of the prevalence of this custom, under the same forms described in mythical tradition. By reference to historical analogy, it were as unreasonable to deny, on the mere ground of supernatural attribute, the real personality of Achilles as that of Vespasian. Were we, then, after tracing the practice from the Cæsars back to the Ptolemies, to Lysander, to Lycurgus, suddenly, on arriving at the epoch in which it takes its origin, to deny its existence, and, appealing to an age and a people of different manners and religion, to substitute in its stead another practice, of which Grecian history furnishes no example, we should obviously be shutting out historical light, instead of availing ourselves of its aid. Perhaps, however, the most pointed illustration of the Greek system of apotheosis, and, generally, of the basis of fact in classical fable, is that derived from the saint-worship

of the Roman Catholic church. The arguments by which it has been proposed to set aside the human personality of Agamemnon or Achilles would equally disprove that of St. Benedict or St. Francis. Many of the Roman Catholic saints are gifted, in the legends which supply the chief or only record of their existence, with attributes still more supernatural than those ascribed by Homer to the warriors of Troy. They have been promoted to celestial honours, and worshipped, in all essential respects, as were the Greek demigods, or deified heroes. Yet no one denies that a large portion of them were real characters, connected with historical events. Nor is it easy to see how an opposite inference can fairly be drawn relative to the Greek heroes from any similar process in the Greek religion.

No less evident is it, on the other hand, from the same analogy of those chapters of mythology on which the light of history shines most clearly, that, in numerous instances, what were at first but visionary objects of superstitious worship may have been invested in popular fable with human attributes. The admission, therefore, as a general rule, on the grounds above stated, that certain leading heroes of Thebes or Troy may have been real men, can as little extend to them all, as a similar admission in regard to the Roman Catholic saints or martyrs would involve a belief in the human existence of all those holy personages; many of whom are as purely fictitious as the Muses, Fauns, or Dryads of antiquity. Any attempt to draw a specific line of distinction between the real and the fictitious element of either the Romish or the Pagan Calendar, must, in the absence of all authentic criteria, be obviously hypercritical. The views, on the

other hand, which speculative interpreters may be led to adopt on the unsubstantial data at their disposal, will vary so widely in different minds as scarcely to leave a common basis on which to reason with each other. The man who, by a careful study of Homer, or the secondary organs of Homer's cycle of mythology, has been led to the conviction that no such town as Troy or no such warrior as Achilles ever existed, will not easily be persuaded that he is in error by the arguments of those who through the same process have been led to an opposite conclusion. Nor will the adherent of the popular doctrine be more readily converted by his sceptical opponent. Beyond the admission, therefore, on the grounds above explained, of a certain basis of fact in the leading adventures of the ante-Dorian period, such as the Trojan and Theban wars, the more cautious advocate of that doctrine will not be disposed to extend his speculations.[1]

Homer's cycle of heroic legend.

7. With respect indeed to the Homeric cycle of heroic tradition, this inquiry involves to the literary critic a somewhat deeper interest than attaches to it as a mere question of historical fact. Every reader of taste and feeling must be conscious how essential to the full effect of a great national poem is a conviction that its principal characters should have been real men, not mere creations of fancy, or types of moral and metaphysical abstractions. In all the higher departments of imaginative art, nature still constitutes an important element; not the mere imitation of nature, but nature as a substantial basis of the artificial superstructure. A

[1] See further on this subject, Vol. IV. p. 315. sqq.

picture by Raphael representing King Arthur or Amadis de Gaule, and embodying with all the genius of that great painter the attributes for which romance gives those heroes credit, could never speak home to our sympathies with half the effect of a real portrait even of Cæsar Borgia or Julius II. by the same artist. Could it in like manner be established that the events which Homer exhibits as great national enterprises, or the heroes by whom they were conducted, were but the dreams of his own imagination or that of his ancestors, the result would be, or ought to be, a proportional diminution of our interest in the character and fate of those heroes. To appeal again to the analogy of our native minstrelsy: would not the conviction that our Wallaces, Hotspurs, or Robin Hoods, were mere imaginary beings, be accompanied by a great falling off in the poetical value of their exploits?

Here, however, it naturally occurs, that the object of all historical inquiry is the discovery of truth; that the question is not so much whether a conviction that the heroes of Troy were real persons would enhance the interest of their adventures, as whether the fact be or be not so. It were, therefore, as unreasonable for the literary historian to allow his judgement to be influenced in any such question by mere considerations of taste or feeling, as for the civil historian to allow his admiration of a particular people or individual to pervert his narrative of their actions, or his estimate of their character. But might it not be urged on the other side, that the very conviction which the perusal of the Iliad produces of the reality of its story is in itself a species of internal evidence in its favour? Are we not conscious of an intrinsic

harmony between the characters and events of the poem and the true genius of Greek heroic life, which marks out those characters and events as human chiefs and enterprises, with as broad a stamp of truth as our own early minstrelsy imprints on its men and deeds of renown in the semibarbarous ages of Britain?

There is one other class of mythical personages who here demand a few words of special notice, from the apparent anomaly of their being those who, as a general rule, have the least pretension to real existence, but who yet supply, in their purely figurative capacity, some of the most valuable details of primeval history. These are the Eponyme heroes or patriarchs who act as name-fathers or founders of countries, tribes, or cities. When, for example, we read that Dorus was son of Hellen, and ancestor of the Dorians, as his father was of the whole Hellenic race, we have an equal element of historical fact, whether the two patriarchs be taken as real or as symbolical personages. Hellen represents the whole more highly gifted portion of the Græco Pelasgic nation, who, spreading from their primitive seats in Northern Greece, finally acquired an ascendant throughout the continent south of the Thracian mountains. Dorus is the type of a martial subdivision of Hellenes, seated in remote ages in the rugged region of Pindus, whence they migrated southwards as conquerors of Peloponnesus. To these and other similar ramifications of figurative genealogy, the most fastidious commentators have not hesitated to attach importance, as representing the real vicissitudes of tribes and races.

Mythical chronology.

8. In proportion to the obscurity which involves the historical ingredient of fabulous tradition, must

be the vagueness and uncertainty of its chronology. Where the existence of men or events is questionable, no great benefit can be hoped from attempts to define the duration of their lives, or the order of their succession. The tenor of these researches will involve little or no reference to the details of mythical chronology prior to the Trojan war. With that epoch commences the most recent, and, in so far, the best accredited, period of the fabulous age of Greece. In treating of this period it will suffice to adopt the received system of reckoning, for the few prominent dates which even here can advance any claim to an authentic character. Such are the interval of about sixty years, from the fall of Troy to the Æolian settlement on the conquered territory, and of twenty years, between the latter event and the Dorian descent on Peloponnesus. This standard epoch will be taken according to the estimate of Eratosthenes, the most critical of antient chronologers, but without implicit deference to his authority, at 1104 B.C., being 328 years prior to the first Olympiad, as fixed in 776 B.C. The first standard date of the partially historical period subsequent to the Dorian conquest is the Ionian migration to Asia Minor in 1044 B.C. Far more important is the epoch of the final establishment of the Olympic games as the leading national festival of the Hellenic confederacy in 776 B.C. This epoch, it need scarcely be remarked, is acknowledged, by the general consent of modern critics, to rest on authentic evidence; and the quadrennial returns of the festival supply, henceforward, a more regular, though far from complete or certain, record of dates and events.[1]

[1] See Table of Eratosthenes, ap. Clinton, Fast. Hellen. vol. I. p. 140.; Grote, Hist. Gr. vol. II. p. 49.; and Vol. IV. of this work, p. 77. sqq.

CHAP. III.

PRIMEVAL HISTORY OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. ORIGIN AND AFFINITIES OF THE GREEK NATION AND LANGUAGE. PELASGIANS. — 2. HELLI, HELLAS, AND HELLENES. — 3. HELLENE, AS A COMMON TITLE OF THE GREEK NATION, LATER THAN THE DORIAN CONQUEST. — 4. GREEK TRIBES SPECIALLY CLAIMING A PELASGIC ORIGIN IN LATER TIMES. — 5. RELATION BETWEEN THE PELASGIC AND HELLENIC TONGUES. — 6. VIEWS OF HERODOTUS. — 7. THEIR VAGUENESS. — 8. PELASGIANS OF ITALY. GRÆCI. — 9. MACEDONIA. ASIA MINOR. ISLANDS.

Origin and affinities of the Greek nation and language. Pelasgians.

1. It was an opinion universally received among the antients, that the Greek territory was originally possessed by the people familiarly called Pelasgians. Hence, in the popular legend, the primitive name of the whole country is said to have been Pelasgia, and the local traditions of each district commonly describe its first occupants as of Pelasgian race.[1] The term came, accordingly, to be significant of remote and venerable antiquity; and those tribes who in later times claimed by preference an indigenous origin, also asserted a superior purity of Pelasgian descent. The internal evidence of these traditions, combined with that derived from philological sources, indicates the people distinguished by this title to have been substantially the same race as the Hellenes or later inhabitants of the country. Both may be considered as sections of the great body of nations comprised by modern ethnographers under the name of Indo-Teutonic; who, in the infancy of society, issuing from

[1] Hom. Il. β. 681. et Schol. Bek.; Hesiod, frgg. 54, 55. 224. ed. Marckscheffel; Acusilaus, frg. 10. 12. Didot; Æschyl. Prom. 859., Suppl. 250. sq.; Herodot. II. 56., VII. 94. sq., VIII. 44.; Thucyd. I. 3.; Ephor. frg. 54. Did.; Strab. p. 221. 327.; Dionys. Hal. Ant. R. I.; Steph. Byz. v. Πελοπόννησος; Schol. Venet. ad Il. π. 233.

their primeval seats in Central Asia, and spreading south-eastward over the Indian peninsula, and north-westward across the European continent, sent forth branches into those portions of it which jut into the Mediterranean sea.

The more accurate researches of the present age into the history of human speech have established, that the languages of those nations who, in antient or modern times, have been preeminent for extent and variety of intellectual powers, may be classed into comprehensive trees or stems, distinguished from each other by an essential difference, both in their elementary roots and their organic structure. Each of these stems subdivides itself into separate families, marked, in their secondary capacity, both as to roots and structure, by certain pervading features of affinity referable to a primitive common type. The subordinate members of these families again, according to the greater or less resemblance which those members, in the vicissitudes of the tribes by whom they were spoken, may have preserved to each other, fall to be ranked, respectively, as separate tongues, or as separate dialects of the same.

Of these original trees or stems of language, the most widely spread and most highly cultivated is that familiarly known, like the nations to which it was common, by the name of Indo-Teutonic. Among its families the most remarkable are, the Sanskrit, or primitive Hindoo; the Zend, or primitive Persian; the Teutonic, or Germanic; and that body of languages which, adopting the usage of the native authors, will here be entitled Pelasgic, comprising, with the several Greek dialects, many other varieties probably, of which no literary remains have been trans-

mitted. The accuracy of this latter head of arrangement, or rather of the sense in which the term Pelasgic has been applied to it, will, it is hoped, be substantiated in the sequel.

The letter of the popular tradition, by specially characterising the Pelasgians of Arcadia[1] and Attica[2] as indigenous, would seem to place the earliest settlements of that people in Southern Greece. It is, however, more probable in itself, as well as more congenial with the spirit of the same tradition, that the primitive inhabitants of the Greek continent should have passed downward from its northern frontier to its maritime extremities, than that, landing on its outer promontories, they should have spread into the interior. A strong argument in favour of this view exists in the circumstance, that the oldest and most revered common sanctuary of the race was in the north, established, as usual in the early ages of Paganism, on the loftiest mountain ridge of the district preferred. This sanctuary was the oracle of the great Dodonæan Jove, in the rugged highlands of Thesprotia. Had the first seats of the Pelasgians been in Peloponnesus, that peninsula would doubtless have remained their sacred land, Taÿgetus or Cyllene their sacred mountain. The national divinity would hardly have been banished to a recent and dreary back settlement. This remote northern region, whether from the sanctity with which it was thus invested, or from its own inaccessible character, seems to have escaped the effects of those revolutions to

[1] Xenoph. Hell. vii. i. 23.; Dionys. Hal. i. xvii.; Ephorus, frg. 54. Did.

[2] Herodot. i. 56.; Thucyd. i. 2.; Demosth. de fals. Leg. p. 424.; conf. Clinton, F. H. vol. i. p. 57.

which the rest of the Pelasgic land was subjected in after ages. Accordingly, while its inhabitants preserved to a late period, under the subsequent Hellenic ascendancy, their antient habits and privileges, Dodona and the Dodonæan oracle remained, both to Pelasgian and Hellene, the fountain head of their earliest and most sacred associations.

Helli, Hellas, and Hellenes.

2. The tribe who dwelt around the temple, and were charged with the sacerdotal functions, bore the distinctive name, in Homer's time, of Selli or Helli.[1] This title was also common to other communities of northern Pelasgians, under certain varieties of form, betraying clear traces of the same etymology. The most remarkable of these varieties is that of Hellas, appropriated by Homer to the whole or a principal part of Thessaly[2], and which afterwards, becoming obsolete as a provincial term, was extended, together with the influence of the tribe from whom it was derived, to the whole continent of Greece. On the western coast, below Dodona, the names Ellopia, Hylli, Selleïs, proper to a country, a people, and a

[1] Il. π. 234. et Schol. Venet.; Pind. ap. Strab. p. 328., frg. 31. Boeckh; Soph. Trach. 1169.; Aristot. Meteor. I. c. 14.; Hesych. v. Ἕλλοι· οἱ Ἕλληνες οἱ ἐν Δωδώνῃ.

[2] Il. β. 683., ι. 395.; Od. ϑ. 726. Herodotus, accordingly (VII. 176.), describes the Thessalians, or earliest Hellenes, as a colony of the Dodonæan Pelasgi, or earliest Helli. Later authorities, in the usual blending of fable (Schol. Venet. and Eust. ad Il. π. 234.; Philost. Imag. II.), made the Helli colonists from Thessaly, as the Hellas Proper. The popular derivation of Hellas from Hellen is an obvious reversal of the just etymology. Hellas signifies a land of the Helli; Hellen, a man of Hellas, as distinct from the primitive Helli of Epirus. Of this legendary connexion of the Helli and the Hellenes, by mutual colonisation, trace is also observable in Homer's notice (Il. β. 750.) of a Dodona in the north of Thessaly, in a position parallel to that occupied by the more renowned sanctuary of the older western Hellas; also in the legend of the Nosti, which described Peleus as migrating with his family, after the death of Achilles, from the Thessalian Hellas to Molossia. Conf. Vol. II. p. 287.

river, afford evidence of the same national appellative in that region.[1] The Hylli, described by respectable authors as "Hellenes," also appear in Southern Greece as one of the three tribes of the Helleno-Dorian conquerors of Peloponnesus.[2]

Tradition is more uniform as to the fact of the name Hellas having been extended from Thessaly, together with the power of the Hellenes or Thessalian Helli, over Southern Greece, than explicit as to the circumstances under which that extension took place. Among the proofs of an early ascendancy of the former region may be urged, that Mount Olympus, originally no doubt but a favourite seat of the Thessalian Jupiter, had obtained, at the epoch of the Trojan war, a precedence in dignity over all the other sanctuaries of Greece, even over that of Dodona. In the obscure ages of Paganism, the rise and fall of religious establishments afford a fair criterion of the fluctuations of rank in the tribes to which they belonged. Thus in the Pelasgian period Dodona was the chief, or, according to Herodotus, the only, common sanctuary of the nation. On the rise of Hellenic power, the Olympian Jupiter obtained the highest honours. The dignity of his Thessalian sanctuary declined in its turn, from the period when a new tribe of conquering Hellenes transferred his worship, under the same title of Olympian, to the banks of the Alpheüs. The "lofty Olympus" now sank, comparatively, from an object of religious veneration, to one of mere poetical celebrity.

[1] Hesiod. frg. 149.; Steph. Byz. v. Ἑλλοπία; Strab. p. 327. sq.; Schol. Ven. ad Il. π. 234.

[2] Scymnus Chius, 407.; Timæ. et Eratosth. ap. eund.; conf. Müll. Dor. vol. I. p. 11. ed. 1824.

Specific notices of these changes are supplied by both Herodotus and Thucydides. "Formerly," says the latter author[1], "the inhabitants of Greece were not known by the common title of Hellenes. The different tribes, Pelasgians chiefly, bore each its proper appellation. But when Hellen and his sons, becoming powerful in Phthiotis, took other states under their protection, the whole race, through the alliance and influence of those heroes, came to be called collectively by their name." In conformity with this account, Herodotus[2] states that the Athenians, originally Pelasgians, had adopted the name and character of Ionians from Ion, a Hellenic chief to whom they had intrusted the command of their army. The Achæans and Ionians of Northern Peloponnesus, also indigenous Pelasgi, had a like tradition regarding the same hero; and the Æolian settlers in Asia Minor are similarly described as drawing their names from chiefs of Hellenic blood.[3] These notices imply that the Pelasgians of Southern Greece, a less energetic people than those of the North, harassed by internal dissensions or hostile aggression, had invited their more warlike kinsmen to their aid, who, in return, exacted submission or vassalage, and ultimately extended their dominion over the whole Greek continent. Among the leading features of the Pelasgian character, an unsettled migratory spirit is always pointedly mentioned. It may hence be inferred, that many tribes, unwilling to submit to their new allies, crossed the sea in search of other habitations. Certain it is, that no record occurs of any great contest for supremacy, nor indeed of any actual warfare, between Pelasgian and Hellene. This fur-

[1] I. c. 3. [2] VIII. 44. [3] Herod. VII. 94. sq

nishes another argument of the close affinity of the two races. The easy manner in which their political interests, manners, and language blend and coalesce, were scarcely conceivable in the case of nations of radically different origin.

The term Pelasgian thus became obsolete, as a generic title of the Greek nation. The dominant tribes, priding themselves on their distinctive names of Ionian, Achæan, Æolian, or, collectively, of Hellenes, dismissed the primitive common appellative; just as the Romans would have disdained, in the days of their Italian supremacy, to be called Latins. Afterwards, however, when the memory of these events had faded, the name Pelasgian continued to be applied, in an antiquarian sense, to the population of certain districts supposed to have remained more or less free from Hellenic encroachment. Hence the apparent anomaly, that, while tradition invariably represents the Hellene as the conquering, the Pelasgian as the subject race, yet several of the proudest states of Greece gloried in the latter title as indicating a superior purity of Grecian blood. In its more specific sense it was limited, from the age of Homer downwards, to certain tribes beyond the frontiers of Greece Proper, whose language and manners bore a resemblance to the Greek, though not sufficient to constitute them Hellenes; or who were held to have migrated in remote ages from Greece. This view, however, of a primitive common character in the aboriginal population, need not be understood necessarily to comprehend every individual people inhabiting the Greek continent prior to the Hellenic ascendancy. The Pelasgic land may have contained, in those unsettled times, various tribes of different race from the mass of its inhabitants; some of which

tribes, when driven into other regions, may, in right of their former place of abode, have acquired the surname of Pelasgians, in common with their fellow-emigrants to whom it more properly belonged. Such may possibly have been the Leleges, Caucones, and other communities, who appear in later tradition among the early non-Hellenic occupants of Greece: but it is more probable that these were themselves Pelasgian tribes, who had obtained notoriety under their own peculiar titles.[1]

Hellene, as a common title of the Greek nation.

3. These accounts of an early extension of the Hellenic name to the whole Greek nation, however universally received, seem yet but little in harmony with the fact, that in the earliest authentic standards of the Greek language, dating several centuries subsequent to the events in which the more extended usage is supposed to have originated, no trace of any such usage can be detected. By reference to these standards, so far is this generic application of the term Hellene from appearing as an immediate result of the ascendancy of Hellas Proper, or Thessaly, that the first symptoms of it are observable at a period when that region had forfeited the high character it enjoyed during the heroic age, and when its natives appear, in comparison with those of Southern Greece, rather in the light of Thracian barbarians than of lineal descendants of the Lapithæ or Æacidæ. This discrepancy between fact and tradition has been noticed by Thucydides.[2] That acute author, after alluding to the extension of the name Hellene, as a consequence of the dominant influence of the Thessalian patriarch, adds, that yet, in the age of Homer, the title was still confined to the single district from

[1] Thirlwall, Hist. of Gr. 2d ed. vol. i. p. 47. [2] i. 3.

which it was originally derived. In order rightly to appreciate this remark, and the anomaly to which it refers, a few observations will be necessary on the poet's ordinary use of the term Hellene, and others of a like nature habitually occurring in his text.

The only names common in the Iliad to the whole Greek nation are, Achæan, Argive, and Danaän. They may all be traced to the influence of the Pelopidan or Atridan dynasty at the period of the Trojan war. The first was the proper name of the people over whom that dynasty more immediately reigned; the second was derived from Argos, its seat of government; the third from the earlier fabulous Argive rulers, the reputed foreign importers of the arts of civilised life into Southern Greece. "Hellas," on the other hand, with Homer, denotes, in its narrower sense, a province of Thessaly, the antient seat of the dominant "Hellenic" dynasty; and there are traces of an occasional extension of the name to the whole of that region. But there is no appearance of its employment in the same general sense as the three others above mentioned. The question then arises: How happens it that the titles Hellas and Hellene, derived from a hero or a tribe flourishing long prior to the Trojan war, should yet not be found in general use until several centuries subsequent to that event? Whatever may have been the early influence of the Hellenic race, the extension of their name, reserved for so much later a period, must be explained by a subsequent cause.

later than the Dorian conquest.

That cause, there can be little doubt, was the Dorian conquest of Peloponnesus, an event which produced important changes, both in the social condition and in the language of all Greece. From that event and its consequences dates the first distinct

separation of the dialects, as they prevailed in later ages, with a more settled use of the proper names of the tribes by whom they were spoken. That the spread of the name Hellene was also a result of this revolution may be inferred from the fact pointedly noted by Herodotus, that the Dorians of Peloponnesus in his day claimed, apparently with his approbation, a superior purity of Hellenic character over their fellow Greeks. The Ionians, Athenians, Achæans, and Æolians, are with him aboriginal Pelasgi [1], who, from motives of policy or necessity, had adopted the Hellenic name. The Dorians, on the other hand, he describes as the genuine Hellenes, in direct line of descent from the eponyme patriarch of the whole race, through their ancestor Dorus, son of that patriarch.[2] It seems then, that these new tribes of Hellenic conquerors were in the habit of distinguishing themselves, by this honourable title, from what they considered the degenerate semi-Pelasgians among whom they settled. The same cause, therefore, which produced the extension to the whole nation of the names Achæan, Argive, Danaän, in Homer's time, the ascendancy of the dynasty to which each properly belonged, would here tend to the same effect. To the north of Thermopylæ the Hellenic name already prevailed. When spread over Peloponnesus, it would naturally extend to the intermediate district, and from the mother country to the colonies; all of whom, like their European kinsmen, retained the tradition of a former adoption of the character, if not the name, of Hellenes.[3]

[1] VII. 94. sq. [2] I. 56.

[3] Another important change in the geographical names of the Greek continent, tending further to illustrate the argument of the text, was the introduction of the term Peloponnesus to denote the southern peninsula of that continent. That this title was not introduced by the hero Pelops,

Tribes specially claiming a Pelasgic origin.

4. Before offering any special remarks on the Pelasgic tongue in its relation to the classical Greek, a short notice will be desirable of those districts the inhabitants of which, in historical times, advanced a peculiar title to unmixed Pelasgian descent.

In Greece itself, besides the Athenians and several kindred states already noticed, the Arcadians [1] enjoyed an especial claim to this distinction, grounded, partly on their primitive simplicity of manners, partly on the ruggedness of their soil, which had preserved them from foreign invasion. On the north-western frontier, the Helli and other neighbouring tribes have above been cited as the oldest Pelasgian stock; and various small Pelasgian settlements are mentioned on the eastern coast of Thrace[2], the western shores of the Hellespont and Propontis, and the neighbouring islands of Lemnos, Imbros, and Samothrace.[3] The Pelasgians of Asia Minor, of the islands of the Ægean, and of Italy, were considered as early colonists from Greece, driven by the encroach-

nor for long after his supposed epoch, is also proved by the negative authority of Homer, equivalent in any such case to historical evidence. The word signifies the "Island of Pelops;" it being a familiar catachresis with the Greeks, especially the Dorians, to apply the term island to peninsulas, as for example in the names Chersonesus, Halicarnessus, and others. It may be presumed, therefore, that, after the fame of the Pelopidan power had spread to distant quarters, its central seat was known among the mountaineers of Doris as the "Island (or Peninsula) of Pelops." This title, when they took possession of the country, they might naturally continue to use as a memorial of their victory, in preference to that of Argos, which, as appears from Homer, the same district bore among the ejected inhabitants. Accordingly, the earliest author of any certain date who employs the new term, and that in the same triumphant strain above referred to, is Tyrtæus, the national poet of Sparta. Frg. i. 4. Bach.; conf. frg. viii. 7.

[1] Hesiod. frgg. 54. 55.; Asius, ap. Paus. Arcad. i. 2.; Pherecyd. ap. Dion. Hal. i. 11.; Ephor. ap. Strab. p. 221.

[2] Herod. i. 57.; Thucyd. iv. 109.; Schol. Apoll. Rh. i. 987.

[3] Herod. v. 26., vi. 137.; conf. Nieb. Röm. Gesch. vol. i. p. 33.

ments of the Hellenes to seek new habitations beyond sea. It is however probable that many of those tribes were aboriginal settlers, portions of the great migratory body, which, on its first movement, may have struck off to the east or westward, while the main stream pursued its course in the direction of the Laconian promontory. On the coast of Asia immediately south of the Troad, Homer[1] mentions Pelasgians among the allies of Priam; and later authors describe the whole Æolian coast, with part of Ionia, and the adjacent islands of Chios and Lesbos, as once possessed by them.[2] In Crete also they are numbered by Homer[3] among the five nations who jointly inhabited that island at the period of the Trojan war.

Of the Pelasgian tribes of Italy[4] the most celebrated are those called Tyrrheni, or Tyrrhenian Pelasgi. By this title they are distinguished from the people of radically distinct character called by Latin authors Etruscans, by the Greeks also Tyrrheni, by whom the greater part of the Italian peninsula had been subdued before the first familiar acquaintance of the Greeks with its interior. In Greece itself, this title of Tyrrhenian Pelasgi was more immediately applied to a wandering race, said to have migrated from Italy at a remote fabulous period; and who, after various adventures in Thessaly, Bœotia, and Attica, finally removed to the coasts and islands of Thrace.[5] In Upper Italy, Spina, at the mouth of the

[1] Il. β. 840.

[2] Strab. p. 221. 621.; Diod. Sic. v. 81.; Con. ap. Phot. Narr. 41.

[3] Od. τ. 177.

[4] See Niebuhr, Röm. Gesch. vol. i. p. 26. 42. sqq.; Cluver, Ital. ant. p. 428. sqq.

[5] Myrsilus, ap. Dion. Hal. i. 23. 28.; Herodot. vi. 137. sq.; Thucyd. iv. 109.; Strab. p. 401.

Po, Ravenna[1], Pisa, and Cære, with the intermediate Tuscan coast from the Arno to the Tiber[2], and the inland towns of Cortona and Falerii[3], claimed a Pelasgian foundation. From the Pelasgi of Latium Dionysius considers the Romans to have sprung, with a certain admixture of foreign blood; and, to the south, Pompeii, and other neighbouring towns of Campania, were also reputed of Pelasgic origin.[4] The same character was assigned by early Greek historians to the Œnotrians, or primitive population of Lucania[5]; and, in later times, the agricultural serfs of the Hellenic colonies on that coast, the remains of the previous inhabitants, bore the distinctive title of Pelasgians.[6] The antient geographical names of this region also vouch for a connexion with the opposite continent of Greece. A principal tribe of Lucania were the Chonians or Chaonians, whose name was common to a people of Epirus. The antient capital of the Lucanians was called Pandosia, as was that of the Molossians on the Greek coast. There was also a Caulonia in each country, and a notable river of each was the Acheron. These coincidences have received lustre from one of the last expiring gleams of the Delphic oracle, shed on the declining fortunes of the celebrated Alexander Molossus, who, shunning the supposed fatal city and river of his native country, met his death in the still more fatal region of the kindred coast.[7]

Relation between the Pelas-

5. The primeval affinity of the Pelasgic and Hellenic tongues, which, though now very generally

[1] Hellanicus, ap. Dion. Hal. i. 28.; Plin. iii. 20.; Strab. p. 214.
[2] Scymnus Chius, 216.; Servius ad Æn. x. 179.
[3] Dion. Hal. loc. cit.; cf. 20. sq.
[4] Strabo, p. 247.
[5] Ap. Dion. Hal. i. xi. xiii.
[6] Steph. Byzant, v. Χῖος.
[7] Nieb. Röm. G. vol. i. p. 59. 62.; Müll. Dor. vol. i. p. 6.

received, is yet far from being beyond the pale of controversy[1], has, in the preceding pages, been in a great measure taken for granted. It remains, by a somewhat more specific train of inquiry, to establish the existence of that affinity on a solid basis. gic and Hellenic tongues.

The relation between Hellene and Pelasgian, upon the view above adopted, may be illustrated by a parallel pair of terms in our own day: German and Teutonic. What is now familiarly called the German is the classical language of Germany with its various dialects. The German, however, is itself but the most cultivated variety of a numerous family of tongues, which, under the common title of Teutonic, comprises the Anglo-Saxon, Danish, Dutch, and others.[2] Similar was the connexion of the Hellenic and the Pelasgic. The latter was the family or tree of which the former was the most flourishing branch; and as the classical Greek, in historical times, offers numerous varieties of idiom, the same, it may be supposed, was the case with the degenerate or less cultivated growths.

[1] On the affirmative side see Müll. Dor. vol. I. p. 6., and Die Etrusk. Einl.; Clint. Fast. Hell. vol. I. p. 92.; Giese, Der Aeolische Dialect, I. 3.; Thirlw. Hist. of G. vol. I. ch. ii.; cf. Nieb. Röm. G. vol. I. p. 26. sqq. For the opposite view see Kruse, Hellas, vol. I. c. v.; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. II. p. 345. To the authorities in favour of the common origin of the two nations may be added that of Lepsius (Ueber die Tyrrhen. Pelasger; conf. Annali dell' Inst. Archeol. 1836, p. 186.). But the Italic inscriptions selected by him as specimens of Pelasgian dialect seem to contain very faint traces, if any, of Hellenic etymology, and tend, consequently, but little to strengthen his argument.

[2] To pursue the analogy, the English, Dutch, and Danes would, in the classical sense, have ranked as "Pelasgians," in comparison with the Germans Proper, or "Hellenes" of the central country; and it might equally have become a question, in the Herodotean school of philology, whether the three former ought to be considered as Barbarous or as "Hellenic" races.

In turning to the authorities bearing on this opinion, the inquirer cannot fail to be struck with that neglect of critical philology which forms so prominent a distinction between antient and modern literature. As regards the grammatical treatment of their own language, the Greek critics equal, indeed, or surpass those of all other nations, in the subtlety of their speculations and the bulk of their commentaries. But with this national department of the science they were content. The study of foreign tongues never, either as an object of curiosity, or as an aid to historical investigation, formed with them a distinct class of pursuit. This is a peculiarity of Greek literary history which will require to be noticed more in detail hereafter. Attention is now directed to it, merely as bearing on the question immediately before us.

The Pelasgians were considered by the antients as standing to the Hellenes somewhat in the same relation as the Anglo-Saxons to ourselves. The Anglo-Saxon is a dead language, and a knowledge of it, consequently, is of little practical utility in the present day. Yet its study continues to be zealously prosecuted, as well on account of its philological as of its antiquarian interest. With the Greeks the case was different. The allusions in the extant classics to the Pelasgian dialects, spoken or extinct, are so scanty or so vague, as to prove that their affinities had never suggested matter for serious scrutiny. Philological evidence, therefore, of a tangible character, bearing on our present inquiry, fails completely. The substance however of the existing notices amounts, at least, to a general understanding, on the part of the Greek public, in favour of the views

expressed in the previous pages, and which may be more distinctly stated under the following heads:

I. That the term Pelasgian indicates a primeval family of cognate tribes and dialects, from which the Hellenic people and language derived their origin.

II. While the neighbouring shores of the Mediterranean were occupied, from the earliest period, by races speaking a variety of radically distinct tongues, there existed no trace or memory of any language not essentially Greek within the boundaries of Greece itself.

III. Those portions of the Greek population who were admitted to have retained, with their primitive seats, their native character and speech unimpaired, were considered, in right of this qualification, genuine descendants of the old Pelasgic stock.

IV. The criterion for distinguishing, beyond the limits of Greece, a Pelasgic people from other alien tribes, was the resemblance of their language to the classical Greek.

Views of Herodotus.

6. It will here at once occur to the advocates of opposite views, that this assumed harmony on the part of the native writers is disturbed by a passage of Herodotus, which, while the most specific that has been preserved on the subject, seems also, on first view, at variance with the above theory. It has here been subjoined entire, as containing a considerable portion of matter vitally bearing on this whole train of inquiry.

"What the Pelasgian language was, I cannot distinctly say; but, if we may judge from the Pelasgi who inhabit the town of Creston above the Tyrsenians, (and who were once neighbours of the people now called Dorians, for they formerly possessed the country

since named Thessaliotis), or from the Pelasgians of Placia and Scylace on the Hellespont who were once settled among the Athenians, or from any other tribes originally Pelasgian who have adopted other names, if we may judge from these, the Pelasgians must have spoken a barbarous tongue. If, therefore, the whole Pelasgian race were of this character, the Athenian people, being Pelasgians, on being converted into Hellenes, must, also, have changed their language. For the Crestonians and Placians, while they do not correspond in dialect with any of the surrounding tribes, correspond with each other, which shows them both to have preserved the dialectical peculiarities by which they were distinguished when they migrated into those countries.

"But the Hellenic race, from its first existence, has always used the same language. Being originally weak when split off from the Pelasgians, it increased, advancing in power, from small beginnings, to a great multitude of nations, chiefly in consequence of many other barbarous tribes uniting with it." [1]

Did this passage stand alone, it might tend, no doubt, to invalidate the views here advocated. In connexion, however, with others in the same work, it assumes a different aspect. Apart from its historical importance, it also possesses value, from the lively manner in which it reflects some of the characteristic peculiarities of its author. On the one hand it displays that spirit of candour and diffidence in the discussion of obscure topics which forms a principal charm of his style; on the other, a certain vagueness both of argument and conclusion, consequent on the imperfection of the critical art, which may be considered less his own fault than that of his age.

[1] i. 57. sq.

Hence, however valuable in themselves, the statements it contains will be found but little in harmony with each other, and altogether at variance with those advanced in subsequent portions of his history.

The literal value of the passage, as affecting the present question, lies chiefly in the application of the term "barbarous" to the language of those Thracian communities, as compared with the classical Greek. Some commentators have understood the phrase to imply, not a different language, but merely a rude or corrupt Hellenic dialect. But this interpretation, though in some degree countenanced by parallel texts of Herodotus, is here scarcely admissible. The word is one, indeed, of very loose signification. In its origin it denotes, like some similarly expressive terms in our own tongue, simply harsh, discordant, or unintelligible. Afterwards it came to indicate whatever was opposed to Hellenic, either in speech, or, by a natural transition, in origin or manners; and may hence, in the familiar usage of classical times, be often translated "foreign," as the substantive "barbarian" denotes simply foreigner. It is also occasionally used, in its more primitive signification, to express anything rude or savage either in character or language, and in this sense is applied even to people of admitted Greek origin. Upon the whole however, in the spirit of the historian's general argument, there can be little doubt of his having meant to stigmatise the dialect of these tribes as a "foreign" tongue, in the literal sense, compared with his own. On the other hand, it is not to be supposed that his opinion was the result of any actual analysis of its structure or affinities, a task for which Herodotus was probably as little disposed as qualified; nor, consequently, is

his evidence, even on the least favourable interpretation, sufficient to disprove its connexion with the Greek. The two may still have resembled each other as much as the Swedish the German, or the Spanish the Italian. In each of these cases the difference is such as to constitute, in the familiar sense, the one a foreign tongue, as compared with the other, although in each the critical inquirer discovers a close affinity. The vicissitudes which these Thracian tribes had undergone, during several centuries of migration, might alone suffice to alter their dialect to such an extent as would justify the expression of Herodotus.

Their vagueness.

7. In applying their case, however, to the nation at large, the historian speaks somewhat diffidently. "If," he remarks in the sequel of the same context, "the whole Pelasgian race were of this description, the Athenians, being Pelasgians, on adopting the Hellenic character must have changed their language." He overlooks the question, whether it was not more likely that two petty tribes, wandering for centuries over the European continent, should have changed *their* language, than that an independant stationary Greek community should have undergone any such metamorphosis. The modern philologer must reason differently. With him the fact, admitted not only by Herodotus but by the general consent of antiquity, that the Athenians were an indigenous Pelasgian people, must amount to proof that the Pelasgic and Attic languages were substantially the same. There is no foreign element in the latter to warrant the belief of its having been subjected to any radical change not common to the other Hellenic dialects. The notion of so sudden a revolution in speech and habits as these Attic Pelasgians, with their neigh-

bours the Achæans and Ionians, are supposed to have undergone "on the Hellenc Ion being appointed general of their army," as elsewhere stated by the same Herodotus[1], is chimerical. In historical times, examples occur of provinces attached to a great empire abandoning their own tongue, and adopting that of the dominant state. But this can only be the result of complete subjection to a conqueror of more advanced civilisation than the indigenous race. No such conquest of Attica is, however, recorded in Greek tradition. Not only do all other leading authorities[2] bear testimony to the pure "Hellenism" of its inhabitants, both in character and dialect; but Herodotus himself[3], in his usual candid spirit of self-contradiction, describes them in the sequel as the most antient race of autochthonous "Hellenes." The same title to indigenous Pelasgic origin, combined with Hellenism of manners and language, is pointedly extended by both Herodotus[4] and Strabo[5] to the Arcadians. The latter author further observes[6] that the dialect of these mountaineers, owing to its close similarity to that which Dorian influence spread over the rest of Peloponnesus, came to be comprised under the common head of Doric. This correspondence between the language of the Pelasgian aborigines of the south, and that of the Dorian immigrants from the north, described by Herodotus as the genuine Hellenes, is in itself conclusive evidence of a primitive community of Greek character in the two races.

Another remarkable series of passages in Herodotus

[1] VIII. 44., VII. 94. sq.

[2] Thuc. I. 2.; Plato, Menexen. p. 245. D.; Isocrat Panathen. c. 132.; conf. Clint. F. H. vol. I. p. 57. By Plato and Isocrates the term Hellene is here used as synonymous with that of Pelasgian in Herodotus.

[3] VII. 161. [4] II. 171. [5] Page 221. 388. [6] Page 333.

abundantly proves that, amid his crude speculations on these isolated Thracian tribes, he was himself under the habitual impression, common to the mass of his countrymen, that Pelasgians and Hellenes were radically the same people. Treating of the origin of the Greek religion, he observes[1] that "the names of such of the gods as were not derived from the barbarians were of Pelasgic invention." Here, therefore, Pelasgian and Barbarian are no longer synonymous, but distinctive terms. "The Pelasgians," he adds[2], "formerly sacrificed to the gods under no separate names, calling them generally Θεούς, as having placed in order (κόσμῳ θέντες) the universe." Here the Pelasgians are made not only to use the Hellenic name for the gods, but to form it out of another Hellenic root by a subtle exercise of verbal etymology. He then relates[3], among other examples of "barbarian" influence on the early Greek religion, how "the Phœnicians, having carried off two priestesses of the Theban Jove, sold them as slaves, the one to the Libyans, the other to the Hellenes. The Egyptian woman, on her arrival in the district of Thesprotia, now called Hellas but then Pelasgia, becoming familiar with the Hellenic tongue, communicated her mysteries to the natives." The Dodonæan fable, where this priestess was figured by a black pigeon, he interprets as allusive to her "barbarous speech," which induced the natives on her arrival, "before she had acquired the Hellenic tongue, to call her the Pigeon, those who speak a barbarous language being held to chatter as birds." She could hardly have acquired the Hellenic tongue from a Pelasgian people, had the two languages been radically distinct. But without scrutinising details, it is plain

[1] II. 50. [2] II. 52. [3] II. 54. sq.

that, throughout this whole series of passages, the terms Pelasgian and Hellene as applied to the primitive population and dialect of Greece, are so entirely synonymous with each other and opposed to barbarous, that unless Herodotus be understood, in writing this portion at least of his work, to have been under a full conviction of their virtual identity, his text is altogether nugatory. In another passage he pointedly calls the Dodonæans Hellenes, in the most specific sense, as distinct from the barbarous races to the north.[1]

The Dodonæan sanctuary was long the most revered oracular fane of the Greek nation. Both Homer and Hesiod describe it as familiarly consulted by their heroes; but it can hardly be supposed that all civilised Greece was used to receive the divine commissions in an unintelligible dialect, from a barbarian priesthood. In those days, therefore, the Pelasgian ministers of the oracle must have been Greeks. Aristotle, accordingly, in recognising the identity between their title Helli and that of Hellene, acknowledges the common origin of the two races, describing the Dodonæan territory, with others the primitive Pelasgia, as the "most antient Hellas."[2] No classical author seems to have doubted that these ministers of Jove had, with their antient seats and privileges, maintained their language unimpaired. It is also evident, from the details given by Herodotus of his own intercourse with them, that in his time that language was Greek, as are the names of the three priestesses whom he mentions.

[1] iv. 33. The same is indirectly said of the Molossians (vi. 127.). It need scarcely be added, that the term Pelasgian is habitually and constantly applied by the tragic poets to the aboriginal Hellenic population of Greece.

[2] Meteorol. i. 14.

Pelasgi of Italy.

8. A no less decisive proof of the substantial affinity of the two races, or at least of the general conviction of classical writers on the subject, is the familiar manner in which the term Pelasgian is applied to colonies, settled in foreign regions at periods beyond the reach of authentic history, but distinguished from the surrounding nations by Grecian manners and language. Italy is the country which offers the most important illustrations of this usage. Unlike the neighbouring continent of Greece, which from time immemorial had been occupied by the same race, that peninsula was divided among tribes differing from each other in origin and speech, many of whom retained their distinctive character up to a late period. To the question therefore, what was the criterion for distinguishing the Pelasgians of Italy from their neighbours the Etruscans, Oscans, and Umbrians, the answer invariably recurs, their resemblance to, or identity with, the Hellenes. Spina, for example, at the mouth of the Po, is celebrated by Hellanicus, Dionysius, and others [1], as one of the earliest and most powerful Pelasgic settlements in that country. Strabo [2] however, in treating of the same city, calls it Hellenic, adding, in proof of the distinguished character it formerly bore as such, that it possessed a treasury at Delphi. The same author [3] calls Cære, or Agylla, which he also states to have had its Delphic treasury, a Pelasgian city. That the term Pelasgian is here employed as equivalent to Grecian, appears from the popular fable he recounts of the change of the name Agylla to Cære by the Etruscans. These conquerors, on appearing before the

[1] See page 47. note 6. supra.

[2] Page 214.; conf. Plin. III. 20.

[3] Page 220.

place, called out to the people on the walls, demanding its name. Their address, not being intelligible to the Agyllians, was answered simply by the Greek salutation, Chaire, Hail; which word, the strangers, in their turn, mistaking for a reply to their question, adopted as the Etruscan title of the town. Both the story and the etymology are trivial, but the argument is not the less valid in favour of the prevailing conviction that the Pelasgians spoke Greek. The testimony of Dionysius, the author who treats at greatest length of the Italian Pelasgi, is no less conclusive. One favourite object of his great historical work is to prove that the Romans were of Hellenic origin; this he does[1] by deducing their descent from the Pelasgians. A people whom he calls Aborigines are described, after expelling the Siculi, as "coalescing with the Pelasgians and other Hellenic tribes," from which union sprang the Romans. The Pelasgians of Thessaly, from whom he derives those of Italy, are also characterised by him as "a Hellenic race" in language and habits.[2] Among their heroes he mentions Achæus, Phthius, and other patriarchal Hellenic chiefs; and, throughout his commentaries, the two terms Pelasgic and Hellenic are constantly used as identical, while the names of most of the Pelasgic cities of Italy which he enumerates betray a palpable Greek etymology.[3]

[1] I. passim, II. 1.; conf. Plut. in Romulo, init. That the old Latin tongue contains a copious element of Greek, or rather of a language closely akin to the Greek, is certain: but it also contains a large amount of words and forms of a different character. This Dionysius explains by an early mixture of a Pelasgic with a barbarous population. Modern scholars are now rather disposed to class the Latin as an independant branch of the common Indo-Teutonic stem.

[2] I. 17.

[3] Velia, Agylla, Pyrgi, Alsium; to which may be added, Pisa, Thrasy-

Græci.

Aristotle[1] divides the Pelasgi of the "primitive (Dodonæan) Hellas" into two tribes, the Selli of Homer, and those "formerly called Græci, but now Hellenes." The latter, therefore, were, in Aristotle's estimation, a subdivision of the same people, who, while their brethren remained stationary around the oracle, migrated into Southern Greece, and extended their influence over the entire nation. A branch of the same Græci (which name also occurs like Pelasgi, though more rarely, as the poetical title of the whole race) were evidently the Pelasgian colonists of Central Italy, whom Dionysius, probably on similar grounds with Aristotle, brings from Northern Greece, and who retained, in their transmarine possessions, the old national title which became obsolete in the mother country. This seems the only explanation of the otherwise strange circumstance, that the familiar Latin name for the "Greek" nation should be derived from an obscure tribe of Epirus. In the same way may be explained the practice, so inveterate with the Latin poets[2], of calling the Greeks, even of the purely Hellenic age, Pelasgians; while the name Hellene rarely, if ever, occurs in their text in its generic sense.

Macedonia.

9. The question concerning the extent of territory

mene, Maleventum, Grumentum, Buxentum, and others; conf. Niebuhr, vol. i. p. 46. 50. notes.

[1] Meteorol. i. 14. Stephanus Byz. (v. Γραικός) quotes Sophocles and Alcman as having called the "mothers of the Hellenes" Γραῖκες, by an obvious play upon the two words Γραικός, Græcus, and Γραῖα, matrona. Hesiod, in his "Catalogues," makes Græcus son of Jupiter, by Pandora daughter of Deucalion. Frg. xx. et Goettl., cf. not. ad l. Conf. Callim. ap. Strab. p. 216.; Nieb. Röm. Gesch. vol. i. p. 57.; Clint. F. H. vol. i. p. 20.

[2] From Ennius downwards:

"Cum veter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo."

over which the Pelasgic language may at any period have prevailed, is one requiring a nearer insight than we are ever likely to possess, into the relative degrees of affinity which may have subsisted between the classical Greek and any neighbouring dialects not recognised as Hellenic. The Macedonians, whose territory extended along the whole northern frontier of Thessaly, offer certainly, at the period when they first assume prominence in Grecian history, many of the distinctive characteristics of a Hellenic people. By some writers[1] accordingly, they have been classed as Pelasgians; while others, more strongly impressed with the non-Hellenic features of their character, stigmatise them as barbarians. Macedonia had, at a remote epoch, been colonised by Dorian adventurers from Argos[2], by whom the native tribes seem to have been first combined into one body politic, under a settled form of government; and there can be no doubt that the language of the court and the upper class was solely or chiefly Greek. The country appears, however, from the first to have been held by a mixed population; the interior by barbarous tribes, the maritime district of Pieria and Emathia, from the mouth of the Peneüs to that of the Axius, by a Pelasgic race. Of Pieria this may be considered certain upon grounds stated in a subsequent chapter[3], and the antient names of various Emathian localities also betray a Greek etymology. These were the countries first occupied by the Argive colonists, from which they extended their dominion, and partially, it may be presumed, their language,

Asia Minor Islands.

[1] Æschyl. Suppl. v. 248.; Justin. vii. i.
[2] Hdt. viii. 137.
[3] Ch. viii. § 2.

over the mountainous region to the westward.[1] Hence, although vestiges still remain of a barbarous element, the Macedonians certainly appear an essentially Greek people, in all material respects, at the epoch of their political ascendancy. Of the Thracian, Illyrian, and other more northern tongues, the little that is known leads to the inference that they were altogether barbarous.

Besides the tribes of Italy and Asia Minor specified as Pelasgic by the antients, the same character has been ascribed by modern critics, on speculative grounds, to other primitive nations of the latter region. The Trojans, it has more especially been urged, are represented in the Iliad as a people almost identical with the Greeks, in language, religion, and manners. No value can, however, attach to the argument, so much pressed by the advocates for this affinity, that the Trojan warriors are made by the poet to speak the same language, and frequently bear the same names, as his own countrymen. It is one which obviously proves too much; as equally tending to establish the dialects of distant Asiatic nations, Chalybians, Paphlagonians, even Phœnicians or Egyptians, to have been Greek. Poets in every age claim the privilege of giving foreign names a turn more congenial to native ears, and even of substituting new names from their own vocabulary, when occasion requires; and unless Homer had made his heroes of all countries converse in Greek, that is, mutually understand each other, he must have abandoned the composition of his poems. The same familiar intercourse

[1] Müller, Dor. vol. i. p. 2. sqq., Ueb. die Maked. p. 50. sq.; conf. Sturz, de Dial. Maced. ad calc. Maittair de Diall.; Jablonsk. de Ling. Lycaon. Opusc. vol. iii. p. 28.

which occurs in the Iliad between Greek and Trojan, also takes place in the Odyssey between Greek and Egyptian or Læstrygonian. An interpreter is here as little required as between the Tyrian Dido and her Trojan guest in the Æneid. It might, indeed, be urged, that, whatever be the case with names invented for poetical convenience, those of the principal heroes ought to have preserved some near resemblance to native originals. If this test be applied to the chief characters on the Trojan side, Priam, Hecuba, Paris, Hector, Pandarus, their names will scarcely be found referable to pure Hellenic etymology; while several of the older titles, Ilus, Assaracus, Dardanus, have an Oriental turn. Other, such as Erichthonius and Laomedon, are plainly Greek; but whether owing to poetical license, or the true genius of the Phrygian tongue, may be a question. Alexander would seem to be the Greek translation of Paris, as Xanthus, the "yellow river," that of Scamander. The correspondence pointed out by antient critics between certain elementary words in the Greek and Phrygian languages can prove but little.[1] The rule must rather be held to be the reverse of the exception. Tradition, however, may seem to afford indirect evidence of the Pelasgic origin of the Trojans; Dardanus, the

[1] Plato, Cratyl. p. 410. A., πῦρ, ὕδωρ, κύων. These three words are found, under certain varieties of form, in all or most of the Indo-Teutonic tongues. Greater importance attaches to the very curious Phrygian inscriptions first observed by Leake, and more recently transcribed and published by J. R. Stuart, Ant. Mon. of Lydia and Phrygia, 1842. The alphabet is here archaic Greek; and the phrases ϝανακτει, βασιλαια, ματερες, ματεραν, αϝτας, are evidently Greek formations. The context, however, in which they are encased is, to all appearance, barbarous. Whether this mixture reflects a primitive Pelasgic element in the Phrygian tongue, or a later blending of barbaric and colonial Greek dialects, is a question for the solution of which these scanty remains hardly supply sufficient data.

founder of their state, being described in one account as a settler from Samothrace, in another from Arcadia, in a third from Cortona in Italy, all acknowledged seats of Pelasgic population.[1] Less plausible are the claims urged by modern writers in favour of the nations in the south and east portions of the Asiatic peninsula, Carians, Lydians, Lycians, to Pelasic origin; an honour never conferred on them by the antients. Of their language but little is known. The extant Lycian inscriptions are unintelligible, though dating from a period when this region enjoyed the full benefit of Greek civilisation, and written in a variety of the Græco-Phœnician character.

In spite of the maritime power of the Phœnicians, Greek population and influence appear to have prevailed from the earliest period, not only in the islands in the immediate vicinity of Greece, but in more distant parts of the Ægæan. The Cyclades and Sporades must have been, in whole or part, Greek from a remote age; the seat of one of the most popular objects of national worship, the Delian Apollo, being established in the midst of the group. In Crete Homer[2] describes a mixture of tongues, the island being divided among five different tribes: Achæans, Cretans Proper, Cydonians, Dorians, and Pelasgians. It may be a question, how far allusion is here made to a mere diversity of dialects; how far the languages of the second and third tribes in the list, where alone a connexion with the Greek family is doubtful, are to be considered as distinct tongues. No trace however exists of any barbaric dialect among the Cretans of historical times.

[1] Heyne, Exc. vi. ad Æneid. iii.

[2] Od. τ. 175.

CHAP. IV.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE ON THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. LEGENDS OF EGYPTIAN AND PHŒNICIAN SETTLEMENT IN GREECE.—2. PHILOLOGICAL OBJECTIONS TO THE EGYPTIAN LEGEND.—3. HISTORICAL OBJECTIONS.—4. GREEK PREJUDICES CONCERNING EGYPT.—5. PHŒNICIAN LEGEND. HISTORICAL AND PHILOLOGICAL EVIDENCES IN ITS FAVOUR.—6. THE PHŒNICIAN ALPHABET.—7. ITS ADOPTION BY THE GREEKS.—8. MODIFICATIONS IT UNDERWENT. VOWELS.—9. ERROR OF THE POPULAR DOCTRINE ON THE SUBJECT. GREEK NUMERALS. MODES OF WRITING.

Legends of Egyptian and Phœnician settlement in Greece.

1. It may be laid down as a universal rule, founded on the experience of all history, that no extensive social influence can be exercised by a civilised on a comparatively barbarous people, without a corresponding influence on its language. The traditions, therefore, concerning colonies settled in Greece by nations of different origin and more advanced culture, assume an immediate philological as well as historical interest in their bearings on this portion of our subject.

That the Greeks, before their first settlement in Hellas, had already made some progress in the arts of civilised life, is evinced by the fact, that the Hellenic terms expressive of many of those arts are common to other nations of the same original stock, established in widely separate regions. The terms themselves must, therefore, in each case, have been brought, with the objects or wants which they denote, from some primeval common seat of elementary culture. No value, consequently, can attach to the commonplaces which so often serve as introductory

to researches into the early history of Greece, describing its inhabitants as a race of undomesticated savages, dwelling in caverns, and feeding on wild fruits, until trained by Oriental strangers to habits of industry and social life. Still, however, it seems to be established, by a strong body of native tradition as well as critical evidence, that foreign adventurers settled in Greece during its fabulous ages; that they contributed to the civilisation of its inhabitants, and exercised a proportional influence, however slight, on the native vocabulary.

The most celebrated of these colonies are those said to have been led by Cecrops to Athens, by Danaus to Argos, and by Cadmus to Thebes. The two former adventurers were, according to the popular accounts, Egyptians; the latter, a Phœnician. A third Egyptian settlement is that fabled in the legend of Herodotus to have been established at Dodona, in the person of a priestess of Jupiter Ammon. Another reputed Phœnician colony was that of Minos in Crete, an island which not only ranked from the earliest period as a Hellenic land, but rivalled the most favoured parts of the Greek continent in precocity of culture.

The historical substance of the legend relative to Phœnician settlement in Greece is supported by evidence, direct or circumstantial, such as can seldom be brought to bear on matters of remote Hellenic antiquity; and which, as involving a question of vital importance in the early annals of Greek literature, the origin of the alphabet, will receive its due share of attention in a subsequent page.

With the supposed Egyptian colonies the case is different. That Cecrops or Danaus, or the foreign

navigators figured under these names, really were Egyptians, that is, genuine Misraïmites or Chemites, as the popular legend bears, is a point of classical mythology which involves, when tried by the test of modern criticism, serious or insuperable difficulties. These difficulties are of two kinds, philological and historical. Those of the former class, while more immediately connected with the present subject, are themselves also perhaps the most weighty. They may be reduced to a single head, the absence of any such element of Egyptian in the Greek language as could not fail to have been apparent, had the influence exercised by the one people on the early civilisation of the other been such as it is represented in these traditions.

Philological objections to the Egyptian legend.

2. Few subjects offer greater obstacles to the classification of ideas under specific terms, than the affinities of human speech. There are probably no two languages, at least of the old world, however radically distinct, but present such points of correspondence as can hardly be explained otherwise than by assuming, at some remote period, a closer connexion between the nations by whom they are spoken, than can have existed since the settlement of those nations in the region where history first discovers them. Even where, on the other hand, the resemblance between two forms of speech is such as to admit of their being classed as mere dialects of the same tongue, there may frequently be detected in each an admixture of elements foreign to the general character of either. The philologers of the old school were used to explain these phenomena by the hypothesis of a primitive common language, confounded or corrupted into many, by a special dispensation of

Providence, in the infancy of our species. Hence a variety of tongues, each retaining a portion of the original stock, and each subjected to changes in the subsequent vicissitudes of society. This theory, amid all the refinements of modern speculation, still remains, perhaps, irrespective of its sacred authority, as probable a solution of the enigma as critical ingenuity is likely to suggest.

Numerous, however, and complicated as are these modes of dialectical affinity, they may yet, as a medium for illustrating the parallel modes of national connexion, be brought under three more general and comprehensive heads: I. That slight correspondence of single words, solely or chiefly expressive of primary ideas, which is often observable in languages radically distinct from each other, and may be referred to the common origin of the human race, in some cases perhaps to accident; II. That close affinity of structure, as well as roots, which indicates a more immediate derivation from some secondary parent stock; III. Where the resemblance can be traced, after the full formation of each language, to the direct influence of the one upon the other, by colonisation, conquest, or social intercourse.

It is obvious that these various degrees may be blended or modified by incidental circumstances. Thus the second and third will both obtain where two nations, originally speaking cognate languages, are afterwards brought into closer social contact. Of this there are numerous familiar examples in every age. Again, it is clear that, where the third degree is traceable, it must, or may, be accompanied, to a certain extent, by the first; so that, in every such case, the amount of admixture arising from subsequent

intercourse could only be accurately estimated by deducting what was more properly due to the remoter, more general cause.

The Egyptian and Greek languages are admitted not to belong to the same family, but are essentially distinct in character and structure. The degree of affinity, therefore, which would naturally be perceptible, assuming no mixture of the two to have taken place, would be that enumerated as the first class. But had the Egyptians, as the legend would persuade us, established dynasties in the fairest parts of Hellas, the case were different. Had they taught the Greeks the first principles, or more subtle observances of religion, trained them in the usages of domestic life, or the arts of war and government, traces of these benefits could not fail to have been preserved in a proportional amount of that secondary correspondence between the two vocabularies which represents social intercourse. No such correspondence, however, is observable. All that can be traced is of that elementary nature which may obtain between radically distinct tongues, where no such intercourse has ever been pretended.

Historical objections.

3. But the arguments derived from philological sources are not the only obstacles to the credibility of this tradition. They are powerfully corroborated by the dissimilarity of the habits, social and religious, of the two nations, so long as each preserved its genuine character. Among the national peculiarities of the Egyptians, here more immediately in point, was a proverbial dislike to foreigners, an aversion to quitting their own country, or admitting the visits of strangers. In early ages, to eat meat with a Hebrew was an "abomination to the Egyptians;"

and Herodotus[1] asserts that they abhorred all foreign usages, especially those of the Greeks, to the extent of esteeming it a profanation to kiss the face of a Greek, to make use of a Greek knife or cooking utensil, or even to taste the flesh of an animal cut up with Greek instruments. The same author, who yet would have us believe that the Greeks derived all their elementary civilisation from this very people, dwells with admiration on numerous other peculiarities in which the religion and manners of Egypt differed from those of all other countries, but especially of Greece.[2] The Egyptians were divided into castes; their religious ministers, whether of male or female deities, were exclusively men; their clergy shaved their heads, beards, and other parts of their bodies; and the whole male population considered the rite of circumcision indispensable to purity. They worshipped animals, embalmed their dead, wrote in hieroglyphics, and abhorred swine's flesh. In all these particulars the practice of the Greeks was the reverse of that of their supposed instructors. They knew no distinction of castes; consecrated females to the highest sacerdotal offices; their priesthood were neither shaved nor circumcised; they burnt their dead; knew none but alphabetic writing; ridiculed animal worship; considered pork among the first of delicacies, and an acceptable sacrifice to the gods.

Another important feature of distinction between the two races, as bearing on the present question, was the proverbial abhorrence of the Egyptians for maritime enterprise. Sea voyages were looked upon as sacrilegious, pilots and naval officers as infamous persons, and salt water as an impure object. The sea

[1] II 35. sqq. 41. 91. [2] II. passim.

and the coasts of the Delta were emblems of Typhon, or the Evil principle; sea-fish and sea-salt were among the chief articles of unclean diet.[1] This feature of Egyptian character is confirmed by the whole testimony of antiquity, sacred and profane. In the detailed accounts of Egyptian power by the Hebrew prophets, the only circumstance of national greatness omitted is naval force. Neither ships nor maritime commerce are ever alluded to. Homer's negative evidence is equally strong. He covers the sea with Phœnician traders; and there are few coasts or islands of the Mediterranean but are represented by him as carrying on some species of navigation, whether for freight or piracy. But throughout his varied descriptions, although he brings his heroes to the shores of the Nile, he never hints at an Egyptian ship or an Egyptian traveller in any foreign country. It is, indeed, certain, that there were no seaports at the mouth of the Nile in early times; nor was the residence of strangers in the country permitted until the time of Psammetichus (650 B. C.), the first author of this, as of many other innovations on old national usage.[2]

The difference between the genuine Paganism of the Greeks and that of the Egyptians, notwithstanding the pains taken by speculative writers in every age to identify the two systems, is as broadly marked as that in the national character of the races. The affinities of polytheism admit, like those of language, various degrees of subdivision, upon closely analogous principles; and it is only from an ignorance or a misapplication of those principles, that the popular schools

[1] Plutarch, Sympos. viii. qu. 8.; Porphyr. de Abst. iv. 7.; Jablonsk. Panth. Eg. iii. p. 81.

[2] Diod. Sic. i. 31. 67.; Strab. p. 801. 819.; Herod. ii. 154.

of mythology, from Herodotus downwards, have been accustomed to consider the Dodonæan Jove as an emanation from the Theban Ammon, or the Attic Minerva as sprung from the Neit of Saïs. For the better elucidation of this point, one of no trifling interest in the intellectual history of Greece, it will be proper to consider the various modes in which coincidences between the objects of worship in different countries might arise.

The first is that mysterious connexion of certain primitive cosmogonical fables, common, under various forms, to most of the nations of the old world, and which seem to point at some parent stock of tradition as well as of language.

The second comprises those incidental points of similarity inherent in the essence of all polytheistic systems, where the chief deities are but personifications of the objects which most forcibly affect the senses or the imagination; where, therefore, different races, in pursuing the same track, would naturally stumble on the same conceptions. It were indeed surprising, if, between the deities of love, of war, of agriculture, or of the vintage, as worshipped in different regions, there should not spontaneously occur near points of analogy, even among nations of widely different origin and character.

The third mode is where superstitions, already peculiar to one country, are directly transferred to another, by colonies, conquest, or otherwise. Here the resemblance, in name or attribute, can seldom fail to be so palpable as clearly to betray the source in which it originates.

In applying these criteria to any parallel features in the Paganism of Egypt and of Hellas, we must disembarrass our minds of the fanciful analogies of the

popular pantheon; and, forgetting the incongruous compounds of Jupiter-Ammon and Horus-Apollo, place the Greek system, as figured in Homer, by the side of the Egyptian, as illustrated by the native monuments. No two sets of idols can well be imagined more distinct in name or character.[1] Any small amount of actual correspondence is plainly referable to the first or second of the above three sources. At a later period, when Egypt was opened to foreign settlers by Psammetichus, a close connexion by social intercourse was formed, which, in the Macedonian and Roman periods, amounted to an almost entire blending of the two pantheons.

Later Greek prejudices concerning Egypt.

4. It might indeed be asked, why should a proud people be so ready to acknowledge their most important national institutions to be the gift of strangers, rather than the fruit of their own invention, unless there were some real groundwork for the belief? The answer is to be found in the characteristic zeal displayed by the Greeks of later times to establish analogies between their religious rites and those, not only of Egypt, but of all other Pagan nations. This peculiarity may be attributed, partly to a disposition to classify and theorise, inherent in the subtle genius of the race; partly, perhaps, to some natural instinct, which led them, amid the darkness of their own polytheism, to acknowledge a principle of unity in the deity, and by consequence an aboriginal connexion be-

[1] Yet Herodotus says (II. 52.) that "formerly the Pelasgians had no separate names for the gods, until they learned them from the Egyptians." The historian must be presumed to use the phrase ὄνομα in this passage, not in the literal sense, but in that of denomination, personality, character; for it were difficult, certainly, to imagine two sets of names differing more entirely from each other than those of Zeus and Ammon, Apollo and Hor, Artemis and Bubastis, Hermes and Thôt. The contrast might be extended through the whole Pantheon.

tween his popular types in different countries. Hence, as each of the surrounding nations had its own polytheistic system, they were seldom at a loss to discover a new variety of Jupiter, Apollo, or Minerva, in Thrace, Syria, Libya, or any other country into which their theological researches were extended. The same Venus whom they indentified with the Egyptian Athor was still more frequently derived from the Phœnician Astarte; and Jupiter himself, who is at one time styled Ammon, is at another as confidently surnamed Belus. Consistently, however, with the guiding principle of their speculations, it suggested itself, that, among these varied forms of the same divinity, some particular one must be the prototype of the others. The award of this preference to any one nation would naturally be regulated by its claims to superior antiquity of social culture; and the region which could not fail to occur to a Greek was Egypt. The serenity of its climate, the spontaneous fertility of its soil, its early advance in art and science, and the splendour of its monuments, all seemed to guarantee its title to be the fountain-head whence the rest of the world had derived the elements both of religion and art. The intimate relations established between the two countries by the settlement of Hellenic colonies in Egypt, about the period when the Greeks first imbibed a taste for antiquarian research, still further tended to secure to the claims of the Egyptians a decided superiority over those of other great empires to the eastward. The Egyptians, on their part, were not slow to turn to account dispositions so gratifying to their own vanity. Their priesthood, accordingly, on becoming acquainted, through the new settlers, with the native Greek traditions, interwove with them, as

a means of cementing the alliance, numerous fictions, which every one moderately versed in the genuine Egyptian mythology must perceive at once to be completely repugnant to its real principles.[1] These remarks apply more or less to the analogies, real or imaginary, between the monuments of early art in the two countries. There are, indeed, few specimens of Greek art now extant possessing claims to date prior to the reign of Psammetichus, from which period Greek artists and men of science flocked to Egypt from motives of curiosity or study. But the style of the few, chiefly of an architectural character, to which a more remote antiquity can, with any certainty, be ascribed, bears no resemblance to the Egyptian.

Phœnician legend. Historical and philological evidence in its favour.

5. It may, however, be urged, that giving full weight to the above objections, it were yet nothing incredible that a few adventurers from the banks of the Nile, possibly fugitives or outlaws, should have happened, in the course of ages, to seek refuge in Greece; and that, unless some such basis existed for the legend of Egyptian settlement, its antiquity or inveteracy would be difficult to explain. This view of the case may the more readily be admitted, that it is both reasonable in itself, and supported by a version of the legend which, if less familiar, is not less antient or well attested than that above examined, while open to no similar objection on historical grounds.

The most important event recorded in the early annals of Egypt is the invasion of its territory by certain warlike foreigners of Semitic race, Phœnicians

[1] Such are the adventures in Egypt, and subsequent deification by the Egyptians, of Io of Argos, Perseus son of Danae, and Helen of Troy, as narrated by Herodotus, I. 5., II. 91. 112. sqq. See Vol. IV. p. 346. sq.

or Arabs, as variously designated, who, driving the natives into the fastnesses of the Upper Nile, established and maintained, during several centuries, a distinct empire over Lower Egypt. Afterwards, the native powers, regaining the ascendant, subdued and expelled the usurpers, who took refuge, some in the parts of Asia whence they had issued, while others, flying by sea, settled on various coasts of the Mediterranean. The period of these latter events, amid the uncertainties of fabulous chronology, harmonises sufficiently with that at which the Egyptian colonisation of Greece is reported to have taken place. Accordingly, several respectable authors, prior to Herodotus the earliest organ of the popular version, described Danaus, Cadmus, and other Oriental colonists of Greece, as fugitives from Egypt, under virtually the same circumstances above recapitulated.[1] This, therefore, may claim to be the older and more authentic form of the tradition. With such a groundwork of fact, Egyptian priests and Greek mythologers would not be slow, under the influence of the prevailing prejudice, to convert the arrival of strangers from Egypt into a colony of native Egyptians. With respect to Danaus, even the details of the popular legend favour the above explanation. He is there represented as a usurper, or state criminal, driven from the shores of the Nile by the "sons of Ægyptus," literally, by the native Egyptians. He is also occasionally described as son

[1] Hecatæus Miles. ap. Diod. Sic. in Phot. cod. 244.; Conon, in Phot. Narr. 32. 37.; conf. Bekk. Anecd. Gr. p. 783.; Anaximander Miles. et Dionys. Miles. ap. Bekk. ibid. These authors also ascribe to Danaus, rather than Cadmus, the introduction of the alphabet. This seems, therefore, to have been the doctrine of the early Milesian school of history, which first spread a taste for prose composition in Greece.

of Belus, the chief deity and national hero of the Syrian or Phœnician races, whose name, in the Semitic dialects, signifies simply lord or king. Hence Danaus, son of Belus, as opposed to the sons of Ægyptus, may be understood to figure the Phœnician or so-called Pastor dynasty, expelled by the native princes. Cadmus is also described as sprung from a Phœnician dynasty, whose royal residence was the Egyptian Thebes; or as a native of Phœnicia, but sailing from Egypt in company with fugitives from that country.[1] Hence the old historian Pherecydes makes him godson of Nilus.[2] Further indirect confirmation of this view is furnished by the testimony of Herodotus, the chief pillar of the Egyptian system, that whatever intercourse took place in these early times between Egypt and Greece was by means of Phœnician navigators. Advocate as he is for Egyptian art and influence, he never describes an Egyptian ship as having sailed from the Nile, either for Attica or Peloponnesus. On each occasion he is careful to bring his colonists in Phœnician transports.[3]

The philological data, so much at variance with the popular view, are no less favourable to that here adopted. While the Greek and Phœnician languages are as radically distinct as the Greek and Egyptian, the number of kindred words in the two former so far exceeds that which any law of primeval affinity could justify, as to afford strong evidence of a further admixture by subsequent intercourse. A considerable portion of these words denote objects or ideas connected with a comparatively advanced stage of society,

[1] Conon, ap. Phot. sup. cit.; Hecat. ap. Diod. sup. cit.

[2] Frag. 40. Didot.

[3] I. 1. sqq., II 54. This practice is common also to the tragic writers, Eur. Hel. v. 1292. 1433.

such as the more rude might have borrowed from the more civilised people. Among them are various names or epithets of deities and mythological persons or places, not referable to Greek etymology, but significant and appropriate when tested by that of the Semitic dialects. They afford proof, consequently, not indeed that the Greek pantheon was imported from Phœnicia, but, at least, that the rites of the one system exercised influence on the other. The social habits, also, of the Phœnician or Canaanite races, instead of those broad points of discrepancy above noticed in the case of the Egyptians, are marked in many essential particulars by a great similarity to those of the Hellenes.

The Phœnician alphabet.

6. But the conclusive and living testimony of early Phœnician influence on the Greek language and literature is the correspondence, in name and form, of the alphabetic characters of the two nations. This fact, apart from all tradition on the subject, amounts to historical proof that Greece was indebted for the art of writing to an Oriental source. Any more detailed remarks on her early progress in that art will be reserved for a future page. It will here suffice to offer a succinct view, first, of the elementary properties of the primitive Phœnician alphabet; secondly, of the modifications it underwent in its adaptation to their own purposes by the Greeks.

Attention must first be directed to a characteristic feature of distinction between antient and modern practice, in regard to this first or mechanical element of literature. The European nations of the present day are in the habit of designating, both in speaking and writing, each letter of the alphabet merely by the sound it represents; that is, in the case of a vowel, by

its own simple sound; in that of a consonant, with the addition of so much of some vowel sound as is necessary to vocalise its own. The old alphabets, on the other hand, had distinct names for each letter, some of them of considerable length, and comprising various other sounds besides that which the letter itself represented. Thus, what we call simply A, B, G, the Phœnicians named Aleph, Beth, Gimel; and the Greeks, with slight variation from the original type, Alpha, Beta, Gamma. The source of this different usage is to be sought in the origin of alphabetic writing, or at least of that particular alphabet from which all those now used in Europe are either directly or remotely derived, and which bears internal evidence of having been originally formed on a hieroglyphic principle. This will be best illustrated by the analogy of the kindred art among the Egyptians. The Egyptian hieroglyphic was of two kinds: the one figurative or symbolic, where the character depicted represented an object or idea; the other phonetic or *sonant*, when it represented a sound. It is the latter class alone which here requires to be considered. Each phonetic hieroglyphic was, in fact, an alphabetic character, expressing the vowel or consonant which formed the first element of the name of the pictured object. A, for instance, was figured by an eagle, *achom* in Egyptian; B by a goat, *ba;* and so forth. The foundation of the art among the Phœnicians was similar. The name of each letter was here also that of some familiar object, the first sound of which was the element to be represented. Thus Aleph, Phœnician for an ox, stands for A; Beth, a house, for B; Gimel, a camel, for G. It may hence be inferred, that, in its origin, each of these

characters was, as in the parallel case of the Egyptians, a picture of the object itself. Accordingly, the primitive forms of some of them, as they appear in the more antient remains of Semitic writing, Beth, Teth, Jod, for example, are evident contractions of a rude figure of the objects, House, Serpent, Hand, which their names respectively denote.

There was, however, an essential difference in the system as reduced to practice by the two nations. The Phœnicians, advancing from the elements of the science to its perfection, limited their representation of each sound to one character. They thus produced a simple and determinate method of writing, applicable to all purposes, and the rudiments of which might be acquired by a few months' study of a child. The Egyptians, on the other hand, not only mixed up with this more practical mode of expressing their ideas various others of a purely enigmatic nature, but, even as regards the former, instead of restricting, like the Phœnicians, the representation of their phonetic elements to one familiar object, they admitted a variety of signs for each.[1] This singular people seem, in fact, in their system of writing, as of elegant art, not merely to have stopped short on the road to perfection. They were even at pains, by wilfully imposing shackles on its free exercise, to render that which ought to be the simplest and easiest of sciences, as a guide to all the others, itself the most complicated and mysterious.

Its adoption by the Greeks.

7. The Greeks, in adopting the alphabet of the Phœnicians, retained both the forms and the names

[1] It is even doubtful whether, in this accumulation of phonetic signs, the primary condition relative to the initial sound was consistently observed.

of its letters, slightly modified, in the order in which they originally stood; and the significant Semitic terms, Aleph, Beth, Gimel, Daleth, were transformed into the more euphonous, but really unmeaning, Phœnico-Greek barbarisms, Alpha, Beta, Gamma, Delta. These names, through the influence of Greek civilisation, have since become identified with the practice of this most essential of human arts in every age and country; and how few of the millions who now use the "Alphabet" are aware that its name is a compound of the Phœnician words Ox and House, and, as such, a lasting memorial of the obligations under which modern literature and science lie to primitive Oriental ingenuity. While the names of the letters underwent little change, either in Greece or the East, their forms were subjected to considerable alteration; so that between the classical Greek character and the latter Phœnician but slight resemblance is perceptible. The original community of form may, however, be traced in the more antient inscriptions of the two languages.

The Phœnician alphabet contained twenty-two letters. The whole of this number appears to have been adopted at once by the Greeks, but with some variations both of power and order, effected upon principles of analogy, affording further evidence of the antiquity and extent of the general correspondence. This will sufficiently appear from the subjoined comparative table. The first column represents the Phœnician alphabet according to its twofold value, as a representative of sound, and as a numeral system, to which latter purpose it was applied from the earliest period. The second column contains the whole number of letters ever in use among the Greeks. The

first twenty-two of these are Phœnician, and in their original places, as corresponding each to its Oriental prototype; the remainder are of native Hellenic invention. The third column contains the classical Greek alphabet, as finally formed and settled out of the foregoing. The fourth column exhibits the Greek alphabet as a numeral system. The fifth is the Latin alphabet.

Phœnician Alphabet and Numerals.	Full Number of Greek Letters.	Classical Greek Alphabet.	Greek Numerals.	Roman Alphabet.
Aleph. 1.	Alpha.	Alpha.	1. Alpha.	A.
Beth. 2.	Beta.	Beta.	2. Beta.	B.
Gimel. 3.	Gamma.	Gamma.	3. Gamma.	C.
Daleth. 4.	Delta.	Delta.	4. Delta.	D.
He. 5.	E.	E-psilon.	5. E-psilon.	E.
Vau. 6.	Vau.	- - -	6. Vau.	F.
Zain. 7.	San.	Zeta.	7. Zeta.	G.
Heth. 8.	Heta.	Eta.	8. Eta.	H.
Teth. 9.	Theta.	Theta.	9. Theta.	-
Jod. 10.	Iota.	Iota.	10. Iota.	I.
Kaph. 20.	Kappa.	Kappa.	20. Kappa.	(K.)
Lamed. 30.	Lambda.	Lambda.	30. Lambda.	L.
Mim. 40.	My.	My.	40. My.	M.
Nun. 50.	Ny.	Ny.	50. Ny.	N.
Sameeh. 60.	Sigma.	Xi.	60. Xi.	-
Oin. 70.	O.	O-micron.	70. O-micron.	O.
Pe. 80.	Pi.	Pi.	80. Pi.	P.
Tsade. 90.	Zeta.	- - -	- - -	-
Koph. 100.	Koppa.	- - -	90. Koppa.	Q.
Resch. 200.	Rho.	Rho.	100. Rho.	R.
Schin. 300.	Xi.	Sigma.	200. Sigma.	S.
Thau. 400.	Tau.	Tau.	300. Tau.	T
	Y.	Y-psilon.	400. Y-psilon.	U.
	Phi.	Phi.	500. Phi.	V.
	Chi.	Chi.	600. Chi.	X.
	Psi.	Psi.	700. Psi.	(Y.)
	O.	O-mega.	800. O-mega.	(Z.)
			900. Sampi.	

Its subsequent modification. Vowels.

8. That the powers of the original characters, in their adaptation to a radically different tongue, should undergo alteration, was to be expected; and for one

essential improvement the system was indebted to the Greeks. The old Phœnician or Semitic alphabets consisted solely of consonants. The pure vowel sounds, which equally rank as letters in the European orthography, were considered in the Oriental system but as subordinate aids to pronunciation, and were comprehended, like accent or metrical quantity, in the power of each consonant, upon principles with which the reader's intimate knowledge of his native dialect was presumed to render him familiar. But the more correct ear of the Greeks was not satisfied with this indeterminate mode of expressing sounds, which, in their etymology, were little less radical than the consonants, and, in a language so greatly dependent for its full formation on poetry and music, required to be no less exactly distinguished. In order, however, to procure this new class of elements, it was not found necessary to invent an entirely new set of characters. Several of the aspirate, or guttural letters of the Phœnician alphabet, though technically classed as consonants by Oriental grammarians, might more properly be defined as an intermediate order between pure consonant and vowel. The former character, accordingly, they forfeited entirely, as modified into what was called in the same system a quiescent state, where, sinking their proper power, they appropriated each to itself, in general if not in constant use, a particular vowel sound. They thus approached very nearly to what would be classed in the European alphabets as vowels, and lent themselves, by consequence, readily to the required object of the Greeks. These letters were the Aleph, He, Jod, Oin, and Vau. The first four the Greeks adopted as the simple vowel sounds, A, E, I, O. The fifth, which, from the analogy of the others,

ought to have been converted into U, retained its original aspirate power as the Greek Vau, or, as it is familiarly called, the Digamma. For the pure U another character was invented, named in contra-distinction to the Vau, or aspirate U, the Υ ψιλόν, and placed at the end of the twenty-two original letters.

In three cases, where the Phœnicians employed two separate characters to represent different modifications of the same sound, each pair, on being transferred to the Greek alphabet, underwent a commutation of power, and, in two of the three, a corresponding change of order. The first case is that of the Zain and the Tsade. The former of these letters, nearly equivalent to our Z, became the San; the latter, pronounced ts, the Zeta of the Greek alphabet. With the Greeks, however, the Zeta engrossed to itself the representation of both varieties of the Zed sound, and, usurping at the same time the place of the San, became the seventh, instead of, as previously, the eighteenth, in the order of letters. The San, falling into disuse altogether as a vehicle of sound, was banished to the end of the list, where it was employed as the sign of the numeral 900; the name being also altered in later times into San-pi, owing to some resemblance which was traced between its form and that of the Greek letter Pi. The second case is that of the Samech and the Schin, the fifteenth and twenty-first in the Phœnician alphabet. The former became the Greek Sigma; the latter the Greek Chsi or X. The two, in their new capacity, also exchanged places, the Chsi being transferred to the fifteenth, the Sigma to the twenty-first rank in the Greek arrangement. In the remaining case the Teth, representing with the

Phœnicians the simple T sound, was converted into the Greek aspirate Theta; while the Thau, or aspirated T of the Phœnicians, became the simple T of the Greeks; each retaining its original place, but undergoing a slight alteration of name corresponding to that of its power.

The number of vowel signs in the Greek alphabet was subsequently increased from five to seven. The Eta, which at first, like its original the Heth, represented the aspirate or soft guttural, corresponding to the Latin H, was, from an early period partially, from Olymp. XCIV exclusively, employed as long E, double of the Epsilon. About the same time a new letter, Omega, came into general use to represent the long O or double Omicron, and took up its place as last of the series.[1] The Vau, or Digamma, an important agent in early Greek orthography, less, however, as a principal than a subsidiary letter, retained much of its previous character of vowel-consonant, or, in the technical language of the Oriental schools, of quiescible letter. It was chiefly used as a liquid guttural or aspirate, somewhat akin to our English wh, to impart emphasis to the initial vowels of words, and possessed the power, with certain limitations, of creating metrical position. It fell, however, out of use in the classical dialects, in the course of their subsequent refinement, though retained in the local idiom of certain provinces up to a late epoch.[2] It also maintained its place as the representative of the number 6

[1] These new vowels first came into familiar use in the Ionian colonies of Asia, probably at a very early period (cf. Giese, Æolisch. Dial. p. 171.). The improvements were not adopted in the public style of Athens until Ol. XCIV. (404. B.C.) The old orthography hence obtained the distinctive name of Attic.

[2] For the modern digamma theory, see Append. to Ch. vii. of B. III.

in the numeral system. The Koppa was banished from the classical alphabet at an early period, its sound being, in the Greek modification of the system, so nearly identical with that of the Kaph or Kappa, that one letter sufficed for both; it occurs, however, in the more antiquated Doric and Æolic inscriptions. When totally disused as an element of sound, it continued, as with the Phœnicians, to represent the numeral 90, and was also employed in musical notation. After these various changes, the Greek alphabet presented its full complement of twenty-four letters and twenty-seven numeral signs, in the order familiar to every classical student.

Error of the popular theory on the subject.

9. The results of the foregoing analysis are at variance, in many points, with the popular Greek traditions relative to the first introduction and subsequent augmentation of the Phœnician alphabet.[1] According to those traditions, the number of letters imported by Cadmus was sixteen only: α, β, γ, δ, ε, ι, κ, λ, μ, ν, ο, π, ρ, σ, τ, υ. To these Palamedes, a hero of the Trojan war, is fabled to have added four (ζ, θ, φ, χ); and the whole number to have been made up, towards the close of the sixth century B. C., by the poets Simonides and Epicharmus. The fallacy

[1] The author has been gratified to observe that his palæographical views, as substantially embodied in this chapter about fifteen years ago, correspond in all essential points with those since promulgated by his valued friend, Dr. Franz of Berlin. The only difference, even of detail, relates to the connexion between the sibilant letters of the two alphabets. Dr. Franz assumes the primitive Greek San to have been derived from the Schin, not the Zain of the Phœnicians, on the ground of its having been used in the Spartan alphabet as equivalent to Sigma. The author, however, prefers his own conjecture, as more consistent with analogy, and must therefore consider the Spartan usage as a mere provincial anomaly. J. Franz, Elem. Epigraph. Gr., Berlin, 1840, p. 12. sqq.

of these accounts is evinced by the correspondence above shown, both in regard to power and position, between the whole twenty-two Phœnician characters and an equal number of the more antient Greek. Besides, the three letters, Vau, Koppa, and San, are altogether unaccounted for in the vulgar legend, although as distinctly traceable as the others to their Oriental originals; while the Y-psilon, though plainly of Greek invention, is enumerated among the primitive Phœnician elements. The only letters for which the Greeks were indebted to their own ingenuity are the last five of their complete alphabet. The exact period of their introduction is obscure; and the whole further inquiry into the changes which these and other portions of the system may have undergone, prior to its full maturity at Athens in the xcivth Olymp., involves questions belonging rather to the province of the antiquary or epigraphist than to that of the literary historian.[1]

Greek numerals.

The analogy between the two alphabets is further observable in their adaptation to arithmetical purposes. The numerals from 1 to 10 were in both systems represented by the first ten letters: in the Phœnician, according to their familiar order; in the Greek, the Vau, dropped as a purely alphabetic character, was retained as sign of the number 6. The remaining decimals up to 80 are, in both lists, represented by the ensuing seven elements. In the sequel, while the principle remains the same, the minor alterations in the positions of the Greek letters impede the closer

[1] See Franz, op. sup. cit. Introd.; conf. Giese, Æolisch. Dial. p. 171. sqq.

conformity of details up to the number 1000, where the correspondence recurs with similar precision.[1]

Modes of writing.

In the application of the system to the combination of words and phrases, the Oriental nations of every period have been in the habit of writing from right to left. To this custom the Greeks, in the earlier period of their practice, also conformed, several of the older extant inscriptions being so written; others, however, of equal or superior antiquity, in the now familiar form from left to right, imply that from a remote period both modes were in use. A third method peculiar to the Greeks, and which remained in partial use down to the time of Solon, was where the lines proceeded from right to left, and from left to right, in alternate order. This was called the Bustrophedon, or "Turn-ox," method, from its resemblance to the course of the plough in the tillage of land. The now universal European practice seems to have completely superseded both the others about the period of the Persian war.

[1] See Matthiæ, Gr. Gram. § 1. 4.; Gesenius, Hebr. Gram. 1. § 5. It is remarkable, however, that little or no trace of this mode can be discovered among the Greeks until a comparatively late period. The ordinary method, in classical ages, was the employment of perpendicular lines for units up to four, Π (πέντε) stood for five, Δ (δέκα) for ten, Η (ἑκατόν) for hundred, Χ (χίλια) for thousand, Μ (μύρια) for ten thousand; or, where the whole alphabet was used, its letters ranked in their familiar Hellenic order, as, for example, in the numbering of the books of Homer, where α is 1, ω 24. The other mode does not appear to have become general before the first century of the Roman empire. It is difficult, however, to understand how it could have occurred to the public of that age to adopt so apparently anomalous a system, if not sanctioned by previous custom. It is more probable that the Phœnician method had been employed in Greece from time immemorial, but confined to local or provincial, possibly to literary, as distinct from monumental, usage. The first extant traces of it are in the older Græco-Egyptian papyri; and, under the auspices of the Alexandrian grammarians, it finally became universal. Conf. Franz, op. cit. p. 346. sq.

CHAP. V.

STRUCTURE AND GENIUS OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. INFLUENCE OF SOIL, CLIMATE, AND NATIONAL CHARACTER ON LANGUAGE.—2. PRINCIPLE OF FORMATION COMMON TO THE INDO-TEUTONIC TONGUES.—3. CONTRAST OF THE SEMITIC AND CHINESE.—4. CHARACTERISTIC PROPERTIES OF THE GREEK BRANCH OF THE INDO-TEUTONIC STEM.

Influence of soil, climate, and national character on language.

1. The settlement of Oriental colonies in Greece produced no sensible effect on the character either of the language or the nation. The strangers appear in the tradition as few in number, refugees rather than invaders. Their national peculiarities were speedily merged in the common mass of native usage; just as the language and habits of the Norman chiefs of our own dark ages coalesced with those of the native Franks or Celts of the countries occupied by those adventurers. Hence, the foreign element, though distinguishable in the Greek vocabulary by the test of critical etymology, rarely if ever offends by any incongruity of sound or structure. The classical Greek tongue, therefore, in any remarks on its original genius, may safely be considered as a genuine uncorrupted scion of the primitive Indo-Pelasgian stock.

By writers on the early history of society, too much weight has usually been attached to the influence of soil, climate, or other physical accidents in the formation of national character; too little to the faculties originally stamped by Providence on different races. Innate qualities must here be dis-

tinguished from mere development, the vegetative power of the root from that of the soil. External causes may, where unfavourable, blight the germ of the indigenous plant; where propitious, may add luxuriance to its growth, or even bring the same seed to maturity in less congenial sites. But the effect produced must still depend on the materials on which the cause operates. A man naturally devoid of talent for painting will not become a skilful draughtsman merely by residing in a picturesque region; nor will a people naturally deficient in genius attain distinction in art or letters, merely by inhabiting a country favourable to their cultivation. Had the Hellenic race, in the course of its early migrations, fixed its abode among the wilds of Scythia, we might at this day have been under as little obligation to its artists or authors as to those of the Tartar tribes who now inhabit the same regions. Had Greece, on the other hand, in the vicissitudes of human settlement, fallen to the lot of a swarm of Huns, centuries of brilliant sun and balmy air would hardly have infused into them the spirit of Homer or Phidias. To take a nearer case of illustration: Did national genius depend in any essential degree on soil or climate, how happened it that the Lydian or Carian aborigines of the Asiatic coast, or the Samnians and Sicanians of the two Sicilies, were so deficient in those tastes and talents which the Greeks so brilliantly displayed in the same countries?

If, in the great scheme of Providence for the moral advancement of the creation, to every people, as to every individual, a distinct part has been allotted in the drama of temporal existence, the Greek nation may be assumed, long before its subjection to any second-

ary influences, to have been preordained the special instrument of perfecting those delightful arts which, while in themselves the most effectual means of softening the ruder element of our nature, afford the purest sources of mental enjoyment. The same Providence which formed the design adopted also the most efficacious means of carrying it into effect, by placing this favoured people under a bright but temperate heaven, in a fertile and salubrious land, offering in its interior every variety of scenery, from the softest amenity to the extreme of grand and terrible, and intersected by gulfs and arms of the sea, opening up a continued succession of inspiring prospects, with a boundless sphere of activity for the intellectual faculties. What has been said of the genius of the people applies equally to their language. The influence of local circumstances in promoting its harmony, richness, and flexibility, was limited to maturing those properties the germ of which was coexistent with the nation. General theories as to the direct operation of such causes are, indeed, belied by the experience of every critical linguist, which readily supplies examples of languages remarkable for euphony flourishing in rugged inhospitable countries, and of harsh and jarring accents among the aborigines of the most genial climates.

That the character of a language should correspond to that of the people by whom it is spoken is a more accurate doctrine, and one finely exemplified in the case of the Greeks. The origin of human speech is itself a mystery which no human ingenuity can be expected ever thoroughly to penetrate. The most plausible theory is, that words were at first imitative of the ideas they express, being called into existence

to denote the objects by which man was surrounded, or the wants by which he was assailed. Accordingly, in every primitive tongue, numerous elementary terms are evidently the result of attempts to express ideas by some inflexion of the voice, between which and the idea itself there existed, or was imagined to exist a certain resemblance. In many cases where the thing to be represented was directly associated with some sound, the resemblance may be called real. Obvious examples occur in the names of various animals, or the terms expressive of their cries. But there are also cases where, though no such immediate connexion exists, ideas are yet closely associated with sound by a sympathy between the senses, which leads to the designation of objects remarkable for a certain quality as experienced through the organs of vision, touch, or taste, by words productive of a similar sensation on the organs of hearing. This sympathy extends to moral qualities, the varieties of which may be expressed by corresponding shades of softness or asperity, density or liquidity, in the sounds by which they are denoted. In proportion, therefore, as the perceptive faculties of a people are delicate and acute, will be the imitative precision of these elementary tones as developed through the above process. This sympathy between words and ideas, while an important element of beauty in every language, constitutes one of the chief advantages which original tongues possess over those of a derivative character, where, in the vicissitudes of mixture or corruption, any such harmony must, in a large proportion of cases, be extinguished.

But the excellence of a language depends even less perhaps on the expressive power of its primitive elements, than on their adaptation, infinitely com-

bined and varied, to the more complicated ideas of which the fabric of human speech is composed. Harmony of sound must be subservient to that of form and arrangement. As, however, the musical organs and the intellectual faculties have no necessary dependance on each other, even where the previous stage of invention may have been accomplished under the best auspices, the further process of combination may be jejune and defective. Hence languages highly expressive in regard to sound are often deficient in point of structure. In order, therefore, to the attainment of the highest excellence, it is essential, first, that a language should be the original invention of the people who speak it; secondly, that this people should be gifted, not only with a fine sense of euphony, but with variety and extent of intellectual powers. These favourable circumstances were combined, in the case of the Greek, in a greater degree than in that of any other known language. While it is in all essential respects a radically original tongue, its mechanism, both in sound and structure, reflects all the harmony, versatility, and precision, which mark the genius of the race by whom it was spoken.

Principle of formation common to the Indo-Teutonic tongues.

2. The foundation common to the Greek with other scattered members of the great Indo-Teutonic stem is a certain number of monosyllabic roots, expressive of primary ideas, and capable of being combined into other secondary forms signifying objects or ideas of a more complex character. The same process, carried through upon similar principles, in respect to these secondary forms, makes up the complement of the language. In the different stages of this process, words are also subject to internal changes, by the curtailment, augmentation, or alteration of their own letters or syllables, partly as a means of varying the

sense, partly of modifying the sound, whether for the sake of euphony, or of its closer adaptation to the object to be expressed.

In so far as the words of this more complex order present the objects expressed each in its abstract or independent character, the above process is classed by grammarians under the head of Composition. Where this abstract character is modified, by reference to time, place, or circumstances, it is called Flexion.

Take, for example, the terms θεος, θεα, θειος. The primitive root may here be considered as the monosyllable θε, denoting the idea of *Divinity* in its simplest form. The addition of another primitive root, ος, denoting male gender, gives θεος, a god; that of α, denoting feminine gender, θεα, a goddess; that of ιος, denoting quality or property, gives θειος, divine. In all these secondary forms, the new idea subsists in its simple integrity, in the same abstract mode as the primary idea itself. But if any one of these derivatives be affected by other component elements, signifying a certain relation, such as possession, privation, propinquity, distance, between itself and some other idea extraneous to it, the word is then said to be subject to flexion. As an example may be taken the change of the last syllable of θεος into the genitive θεου. Here the object is no longer contemplated in its independent capacity, but in its relation to some other object expressed or understood.

The whole body of primitive, and, with certain restrictions as to compass or euphony, even secondary roots of the Greek tongue, are qualified to enter, in one or other of the above modes, into the formation

of new words. Those employed in flexion, comparatively few in number, and serving, under the same or slightly varied forms, for the modification of every word susceptible by nature of such influence, have become for the most part obsolete in their primary character. They have, as it were, forfeited their own independence, in order to give greater precision and effect to their power of varying and extending the influence of their fellows. The same remark applies also to a certain number of the more elementary class of roots employed in composition.

Contrast of the Semitic and Chinese.

3. The above properties, common, more or less, to all the Indo-Teutonic languages, will be best appreciated by a comparison with the methods adopted by other radically distinct families of human speech for attaining the same objects. Of these families the most remarkable are, the Semitic or Aramaïc, comprising the Hebrew, Arabic, Phœnician, and others, extending over the greater part of South-western Asia; and that less fully explored by European scholars, of which the Chinese is the most widely spread and highly cultivated variety.

The fundamental elements of the Chinese tongue are also monosyllabic roots. But their combination, both etymological and syntactical, is very different from that above illustrated; being effected neither by composition nor flexion, but by a simple juxtaposition of the primary terms which embody the whole complex idea to be expressed.[1]

The distinguishing properties of the Semitic family are, first, the limitation of the radical elements of

[1] This rule applies strictly, perhaps, only to the older purer Chinese. The dialect of the present day is understood to admit also, though sparingly, the principle of amalgamation which forms the characteristic property of the Indo-Teutonic.

words to consonants, the vowel sounds being but a subsidiary mechanism for imparting to the others their articulate power; and, secondly, the prevalence of bisyllabic or triliteral roots. In the representation of complex ideas, the Semitic steers a middle course between the jejune dryness of the Chinese and the elegant versatility of the Greek. Repudiating almost entirely, in the creation of new terms, the Greek principle of composition, it resorts for the same purpose either to variations in the elementary roots by aid of the vowel sounds, or to the Chinese plan of juxtaposition. In flexion, on the other hand, although it admits of an extensive combination of roots, the subsidiary elements are far from blending with the principal word in the same easy spirit of coalition as in the Greek conjugations or declensions. Those elements have acquired accordingly, in the phraseology of the Oriental schools, the names of Suffix, Affix, and others similar, instead of that of Flexions as among Greek grammarians.

The superiority of the Indo-Teutonic principle has been generally recognised by critical philologers. The rich variety of expression which it secures, both in the first formation and the grammatical developement of words and phrases, is but ill compensated, in the rival tongues, by greater uniformity of method and etymological precision. These latter qualities, always of somewhat questionable value when carried beyond a certain point, degenerate in the Chinese into tasteless monotony. Where certain ideas instinctively form themselves in the mind of the speaker into collective groups, as in the more advanced stages of Greek composition and flexion, it is obviously both more natural and more agreeable that they should,

within certain limits of bulk or complexity, be offered to the apprehension in one animated body, than scattered before it in disjointed members. The number and variety of vowel sounds, which also form a distinctive feature of the Greek tongue, and which, neither immutably fixed as in the Chinese, nor, as in the Semitic, mere subordinate agents of the consonants, appear as active independent elements of the language in every stage of its developement, impart to it a harmony and fluidity, as well as power of expression, to which the others are altogether strangers.

Characteristics of the Greek branch of the Indo-Teutonic stem.

4. The above characteristics, however, of the original Indo-Teutonic stem are far from being exemplified in the same degree, or under the same features of excellence, in all its branches. The superiority of the Greek may be said to consist in having preserved, abandoned, or modified the common properties, in the manner best calculated to bring every variety of idea most effectually home to the understanding. None of the sister tongues can compete with it in regard to sound; while, in several, the composite principle of formation has degenerated into little more than the Chinese expedient of juxtaposition.[1] Of the whole body, the Sanskrit is

[1] The facility which the Greek tongue offers for creating new terms, to represent the extensions of idea involved in the progress of society, is curiously contrasted with the sluggishness of the most cultivated modern languages, in their dependance at this day on the etymological aids of the Greek lexicon for the requisite additions to their scientific vocabulary. By far the largest amount of these additions consists notoriously of Greek compounds, invented to express objects or ideas unknown to the Greeks themselves. The expressive elegance of the classical formations appears the more striking as contrasted with the clumsiness of the parallel Germanic terms; compare, for example, Typography and Buchdrueker-kunst, Telescope and Fern-rohr, Hydraulics and Wasser-baukunst.

understood to have most carefully preserved, in their merits and defects, the peculiarities of the ancient common type, and claims, therefore, to be, if not the parent tree, at least the oldest of its branches. The chief points of resemblance, accordingly, between the Sanskrit and the Greek are in the properties where the former is most to be admired: in fertility of composition and flexion, luxuriance of grammatical forms, and in the many delicate phases assumed by the primary parts of speech, frequentative, prospective, desiderative; reflecting a singular acuteness of the discriminating faculty, and affording in return a rich fund of materials for its exercise. While the Greek thus rivals her Oriental sister in variety of forms, she asserts, in respect to sound, a marked superiority over all the members of the family. The vowel sounds of the Sanskrit are comparatively monotonous, occasionally harsh and constrained. Those of the Greek are distinguished for variety and euphony. In the combination of consonants and vowels the Greek also exhibits the same happy blending of uniformity and versatility, the same just medium between redundancy and poverty, which characterise all the productions of Hellenic genius. The liquid fulness of the vowels is so tempered by the admixture of consonants as to exclude feebleness or tenuity, while the harshness resulting from undue accumulation of the latter, or from the juxtaposition of uncongenial sounds, is equally avoided; and the infusion of gutturals, aspirates, and other less euphonous elements, suffices to insure vigour without creating asperity. The language thus, as occasion may require, combines the sonorous dignity of the Spanish with the melody of the Italian, and the masculine energy

of the German with the precision of the French or English.

Another remarkable feature which distinguishes the Greek from all other European dialects is the extreme delicacy and subtlety of its metrical and musical developement. It is, perhaps, in the earlier stages of etymological formation that this property is most strikingly exemplified; in the distinction, namely, which obtained in familiar pronunciation between accent and quantity, and in the nicety of the laws by which the two were adjusted in their relation to each other or to the language at large. The closer analysis of these laws belongs, however, to the province of grammar or prosody rather than to that of literary history, and could at the best be productive of but little satisfactory result.[1] In the modern European tongues the distinction is unknown. Accent and quantity, the long syllable and the accentuated syllable, are, in the poetry of the present day, as identical as they were essentially distinct in that of Greece. In the absence, consequently, of

[1] The distinction itself, in theory, is quite intelligible even to modern apprehension. Accent, in the proper classical sense, is the tone or key of the voice in pronouncing a syllable; quantity, the length of time during which the voice dwells on the syllable. In so far, therefore, separate effect can easily be given to each, in different syllables of the same word. The difficulty is to understand the extreme subtlety and complexity of the distinction as carried into practice, in the Greek pronunciation and versification. The accent perpetually changing both character and place in the same word, with the slightest change or modification of form, quantity, or value, by flexion, composition, or otherwise. The distinction, it may be observed, is unknown to the modern Greeks, and must have become obsolete at a period when the antient tongue was still a living dialect. In a large proportion of the works of the later Byzantine poets, composed in the classical Greek, accent and quantity are as completely identical as in the verse of Shakspeare or Corneille. See Gaisf. ad Heph. p. 247. sqq.

either experience or analogy, the real nature of the relation between these two elements of prosody in the living Greek tongue, has been hitherto a mystery which no effort of modern scholarship is ever likely to penetrate.

One more characteristic of that tongue, which, in drawing these remarks to a close, still demands attention, and to which also no parallel can probably be found in any other cultivated language, is its anomaly. This feature may be classed under two heads: anomaly of structure and anomaly of syntax. The latter will be noticed in a future page. The former is familiar to the classical scholar in the elementary rules of his grammar: that no Greek verb possesses its full complement of forms derived from the same root; and that many of the verbs in most universal use are dependent, even for certain of their more fundamental forms, on radically distinct sources. This latter peculiarity is common, in some degree, to the other declinable parts of speech; while, in various departments of flexion and formation, even as exemplified in the same root, an equal disregard for uniformity is manifested. The original source of these and other similar irregularities can now be matter only of speculation. It might be assumed that the kindred roots originally possessed each its full complement of forms in the primitive common stock of Pelasgic idiom, as duplicates for the expression of the same or cognate ideas; but that, in the course of subsequent vicissitudes, a portion of those forms had fallen into desuetude. Or certain roots may once have been peculiar, also in their full state of development, to different dialects, blended in the same vicissitudes into a single one, which may have retained

or rejected, in greater or less proportions, the forms previously proper to one or other of those older separate dialects. Be this as it may, it is somewhat doubtful how far this peculiarity, in the extent to which it prevails, may be entitled to the same unqualified approbation above bestowed on the other more prominent attributes of the Greek language. That it constitutes an important element of that richness and variety, in which it may also itself be said to originate, is certain: but it is perhaps open to question, whether those advantages be not often attained with too great a sacrifice of the symmetry and simplicity so essential to excellence in every production either of mental or mechanical ingenuity.

CHAP. VI.

EARLY CULTURE OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.

1. SOCIAL CONDITION OF GREECE DURING THE HERGIC AGE. ITS INFLUENCE ON THE LANGUAGE.—2. PELOPIDAN ERA.—3. ÆOLIAN COLONIES. IRRUPTION OF THE DORIANS. IONIAN MIGRATION. SUBSEQUENT DISTINCTION OF DIALECTS.—4. THEIR RESPECTIVE CHARACTERISTICS.—5. PERVADING INFLUENCE OF THE HOMERIC DIALECT.—6. THE LITERARY CULTURE OF THE SEPARATE DIALECTS A PECULIARITY OF THE GREEK LANGUAGE.—7. APPROPRIATION OF DIFFERENT DIALECTS TO DIFFERENT STYLES OF COMPOSITION.—8. ARTIFICIAL FORMATION OF NEW DIALECTS FOR NEW STYLES.—9. ULTIMATE ASCENDANCY OF THE ATTIC DIALECT. SICILIAN DORIC.

Social condition of Greece during the heroic age.

1. HAVING traced the history of the Greek language through the vicissitudes of the dark Indo-Pelasgic period to that of its final ascendancy as a national tongue throughout the Hellenic continent, we now proceed to consider the elementary stages of its literary culture.

The earliest traditional notices of the social condition of Greece, after the spread of Hellenic supremacy, describe that country as divided into petty patriarchal states, where tribes of high-spirited vassals yielded a ready, but not a servile, obedience to martial chiefs descended from the heroes under whose guidance their possessions had been acquired. This state of society was fostered by the natural features of the country, which marked out the boundaries of the separate principalities, and interposed barriers against mutual encroachment. Its full influence on the language, as exemplified in the distinction and cultivation of the dialects, was reserved for a later period. In these early times its beneficial effects are

chiefly perceptible in cherishing the chivalrous spirit which supplies materials for epic minstrelsy, the foundation of all primitive literature. The separate communities, while presenting, in their relation to foreigners, the patriotic front of a national confederacy, were engaged in frequent wars among themselves, for the most part of a desultory character, and originating rather in points of personal right or feeling than in extensive schemes of ambition. The political state of Greece presents, in fact, at this period, a great analogy to that not long since prevalent in the Highlands of Scotland. The tribe over which the Greek king ruled was considered, like the clan of the Scottish chief, as one great family, of which the reigning dynasty was the oldest branch. In this way every freeman might consider himself a cadet of the royal house; and the free population, at that period, formed probably a greater proportion of the whole than in later times. The subsequent more systematic establishment of personal slavery, that blot on the institutions of civilised Hellas, seems to have reduced the numbers, while it corrupted the manners, of the citizens.

But this community of feeling was cemented by a still nobler tie, derived from the system of polytheism which sprang up among a people keenly alive to the influence of natural religion, but as yet unable to reason philosophically on its principles. Spirit or soul, capable of will and design, they perceived to be common to all rational beings; but having no definite idea of existence or action apart from material form, they figured the influence of the deity, or, in other words, every event or object beyond the apparent control of man, under corporeal agencies, work-

ing by means more potent indeed, but similar in kind to those by which mortals attain their ends. Hence, as the phenomena of the creation are infinitely varied, and often, to all appearance, in conflict with each other, these early theologers were led to embody each class of physical influence as a distinct personality, intrusted with a certain department of mundane affairs, with gradations of rank and power adapted to their respective functions. In this way they had celestial gods who presided over the higher organisation of the universe; infernal gods charged with the affairs of the world after death; and terrestrial, atmospheric, and marine deities superintending every conceivable operation of life or nature. The inferior members, consequently, of this pantheon were so little exalted above the rank of humanity, that the distinction between the least powerful god, agent of wind, flood, or other elementary influence, and the most powerful man, producing, by the agitations of his good or evil passions, effects quite as momentous to his fellow-men, becomes very trifling. By a natural extension of this graduated scale of agency, the divine and human natures became sexually connected. Illustrious men were commonly fabled of divine parentage, and occasionally, at their death, received divine honours. The ancestor of almost every tribe was sprung immediately from some deity, and through him his whole line of descendants participated in the divine nature. Hence the nation and their political pantheon appear in the light of one great physical commonwealth, with a succession of ranks, from Jove to the meanest of Hellenic blood. The only broad line of demarcation between human and divine was the mortality of the one race and

attributed immortality of the other. But this distinction, important as it sounds, is more nominal than real. As the belief in a future state of human existence was an essential doctrine of the system, death was to man but a transition from one mode of being to another. The gods themselves, however, could not only be degraded from their celestial rank, and permanently thrust into the same region appointed for the after-state of humanity, but could suffer wounds, mutilation, and suspension of faculties, equivalent, as Plato admits[1], to the effects of death on mankind.

Its influence on the language.

This connexion between the celestial and mortal nature was a principal source of the high perfection which epic poetry attained in Greece. The history of human genius, in all ages, shows its noblest flights to be connected with religious feeling, whether in the individual or the society to which he belongs. To inspire an Iliad, therefore, required a system raising the mind, as yet unshackled by social refinements, to a habitual communion, if not with the Deity himself in the higher sense, with his power, beauty, and glory, as exhibited in the nobler works of his creation. The influence of Greek religion upon Greek art is, perhaps, most tangibly exemplified in those conceptions of ideal beauty which, though first reduced to definite principles by the arts of design, originate with the poets, whose suggestions were embodied by the sculptors and painters of later times. The popular objects of worship, while figured as men, required to be personified in a manner worthy of the divine character. The Greeks therefore, selecting the elements of abstract beauty which their fine taste

[1] Tim. p. 41.; conf. Lucian. Vit. auct.: A. *τί δαὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι*; H. *Θεοὶ θνητοί.* A. *τί δαὶ θεοί*; H. *ἄνθρωποι ἀθάνατοι.*

discerned in the human form, purged them from the blemishes which they also perceived to be inseparable from the most excellent living models, and so varied and blended them according to age, sex, or other physical accidents, as to shadow forth the most delicate peculiarities of person or attribute in the different deities. In this way the art, not only of idealising corporeal beauty, but of expressing soul and the nicest shades of passion and feeling through the medium of material form, was carried to a perfection of which no other people has ever so much as formed an idea, but from the examples transmitted by the Greeks.

Pelopidan era.

2. The influence of these favourable circumstances seems to have been first fully developed under the dynasty of the Pelopidan princes, during which a closer connexion of blood, interests, and manners appears to have prevailed among the dominant races of Greece than at any subsequent period. This connexion was riveted by a species of feudal sovereignty, which that dynasty is recorded, in the same traditions, to have exercised over most of the southern states; partly acquired through marriage, partly a tribute to their own superior power. Under their auspices the chieftains of the confederacy, without abandoning their spirit of individual rivalry, were induced to turn it in a nobler direction, and combine for the great national enterprise against a foreign enemy, recorded in the legend of the Trojan war. This was the brightest period of Grecian chivalry, which, if it did not produce the noblest masterpieces of heroic song, prepared, at least, the way for their production, both by improving the language of poetry, and supplying the poet with the finest materials for its em-

ployment. It was natural that, among the princely families over whom this bond of union extended, there should arise a common, or, as it were, court dialect, whatever vernacular idioms may have prevailed among their followers. Such accordingly, seems to have been that, since variously designated the old Ionic or Homeric, originally spoken in the dominant provinces of Central Greece[1], and which enjoyed, through the minstrels entertained at the courts of popular princes, a high poetical cultivation. This view of the origin of the epic language is confirmed by one of the most characteristic features of its composition, those numerous forms which, becoming obsolete in its own vocabulary on its subsequent modification into the later Ionic, are found proper to other dialects of a very different character. Such forms may be considered, partly as portions of the parent stock originally common to the Ionic with other less cultivated dialects, and retained in these, while rejected from the Ionic itself, in the course of subsequent vicissitudes; partly as the gradual infusion, into the standard poetical language, of forms not originally its own, on its extension into quarters where it was not indigenous.

Æolian colonies. Dorian conquest. Ionian migration.

3. During the century subsequent to the Fall of Troy (1184 B. C.), extensive changes took place in the dialectical as well as political relations of the Hellenic states. About sixty years after that event (1124 B. C.), dissensions among the Æolian tribes in Northern and Central Greece produced a large emigration from Bœotia and the neighbouring districts to the conquered coasts and islands of Asia Minor, already

[1] See infra, Book II. Ch. xviii. § 4.

partially occupied by the sons or followers of the victorious chiefs.[1] This new settlement is said to have taken place under the guidance of a grandson of Agamemnon; but, as the colonists were chiefly of Æolian race, the expedition bears the familiar name of Æolian, and the region occupied that of Æolia. About twenty years afterwards the Pelopidan power was subverted, and the Peloponnesus overrun by the Dorians (1104 B. C.). This catastrophe was followed, at some interval (1044 B. C.), by a similar settlement of the greater part of the ejected population of the peninsula on the Asiatic coast to the south of the district possessed by their Æolian kinsmen.[2] Through these convulsions the ties, social and political, which had previously united the Hellenic nation were in a great measure dissolved, and the subsequent wider separation of domicile and interests interposed serious obstacles to their renewal. From this period accordingly, may be dated the more specific distinction of dialects which becomes so important in the subsequent stages of Greek literary culture. The Hellenic tongue, prior to that distinction, might be divided into two comprehensive varieties: first, the Ionic, indigenous in the more civilised states, Attica, the lowlands of Peloponnesus, and, probably, other coasts and islands subject to or politically connected with these provinces; secondly, the Æolic in the wider sense, embracing the whole remaining body of less cultivated dialects. The latter, indeed, comprised subordinate modifications, differing from each other little less than from the Ionic. Still however, the general re-

Subsequent distinction of dialects.

[1] Clint. Fast. Hell. vol. I. p. 103.; Thirlw. Hist. of Gr. vol. II. p. 92.; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. II. p. 26.; conf. infra, B. II. Ch. xviii. § 6.

[2] Clint. Fast. Hell. vol. I. p. 113.; Thirlw. vol. II. p. 94.; Grote, vol. II. p. 33.

semblance to each other, observable in the dialects of those countries where the old ruder speech continued to prevail, the Bœotic of Central Greece, the Æolic of the Asiatic colonies, that of the Arcadian highlands, and the Doric of Pindus afterwards spread over Peloponnesus, was such as to cause them all to be classed under one general head, sometimes of Æolic, sometimes of Doric, in the familiar usage of the critical schools.[1] That the Ionic, also, originally comprised secondary forms of dialect may be inferred from the account given by Herodotus of those prevalent in his own time among the Ionians of Asia.[2] We possess, however, in this case no positive knowledge, either from traditional or literary sources, of any so marked a distinction as between the varieties of the Æolic or Doric.

The Asiatic variety of the Æolian dialect, established by the Æolo-Bœotian colonists in the isle of Lesbos and on the opposite coast of Asia, came, in the sequel, to be its popular standard, having been, after a lapse of some generations, carried to high perfection by the Lesbian school of lyric poetry. The language of the mother provinces of Central Greece appears to have undergone no sensible alteration. The prevailing tradition[3] is, that the Æolian migration was caused by the irruption into Bœotia of a kindred tribe from the neighbouring plains of Thessaly; who, expelling the previous inhabitants, themselves afterwards appear under the same title of Bœotians given by Homer to their predecessors. The same Æolian dialect must, therefore,

[1] Auct. ap. Maittaire, Gr. Ling. Dial. Introd. p. 30. sq.; conf. Ahrens de Dial. Æolic. § 1. sqq., et de Dial. Dor. § 1. sq.

[2] I. 142.

[3] Clint. F. H. vol. I. p. 67.

have been common to both, and continued so, under such slight variation as time or local circumstances may have produced, after their separation. In Attica the ancient population, with its pure Ionic idiom, remained undisturbed.

In Peloponnesus, the change of inhabitants was accompanied by a corresponding revolution of dialects. A remnant of the old Achæan population kept its ground on the narrow stripe of territory between the Corinthian Gulf and the Cyllenian mountains; and some other petty tribes of Ionians here and there, submitting to the conquerors, retained their possessions in a state of vassalage.[1] But the language and habits of the subdued race became, in later times, more or less assimilated to those of the dominant states. Elis[2], on the north-eastern coast, was assigned to a body of Ætolian adventurers who had joined the Dorian armament on its passage through their country. As the previous dialect of both Ætolia and Elis was Æolic, no essential change was here produced. The Arcadian mountaineers preserved, together with their independence, their proper Æolian tongue; which, itself closely akin to that of their new Dorian neighbours, had not participated in the culture of the expelled tribes.[3] The districts immediately occupied by the Dorians were, Argolis, Laconia, and Messenia. In the sequel, their conquests, with their language, were gradually extended over Corinth and Megara to the Attic frontier, and subsequently, by settlers from Epidaurus, to the neighbouring island of Ægina.

The ejected inhabitants of the peninsula first

[1] Herod. VIII. 73.
[2] Strab. p. 333.; conf. Hdt. loc. cit.
[3] Strab. loc. cit.

sought refuge among their Ionian kinsmen of Attica. Afterwards, under the auspices of Athenian leaders, they crossed the Ægæan, and occupied the coast of Asia southwards from the Æolian settlements, as far as the headland of Miletus, together with the adjacent isles of Chios and Samos. Here they appear, in later times, under the distinctive name of Ionians. Their subsequent celebrity under this title, and the still greater celebrity of the metropolitan state on the opposite continent under those of Athenian and Attic, caused the first of the three, in after ages, to become so exclusively restricted to the colonies, that the terms Athenian and Ionian, or Attic and Ionic, instead of being identical, as with Homer, were henceforward pointedly distinct. The south-western extremity of the same Asiatic coast, with the adjacent islands, was afterwards occupied by Dorians[1], attracted chiefly from Sparta by the existence, if we may trust Homer[2], of a previous colony established in Rhodes by a son of their national hero Hercules. The Dorians seem also, at a very early epoch, to have acquired an ascendancy in Crete. The language and institutions of that island offer, accordingly, at the remotest period of which authentic notices have been preserved, a close resemblance to those of the Dorian states of Peloponnesus.

It belongs to the history of Greek colonisation, rather than Greek literature, to follow out in detail the subsequent migrations from the different Hellenic states to which so many flourishing commonwealths along the various shores of the Mediterranean are indebted for their origin. It will be sufficient, in the

[1] Müll. Dor. vol. I. p. 103. sqq.; Thirlw. vol. II. p. 100.; Grote, vol. II. p. 41.

[2] Il. β. 653. sqq.

case of each of these communities, to specify on the first occasion where attention is directed to its native authors or school of literature, in such detail as may be required, the circumstances of its foundation and early progress in art and letters.

Their respective characteristics.

4. The old Epic dialect exhibits the efforts of a nation, pre-eminently gifted with poetical and musical genius, and as yet neither aided nor shackled by grammatical refinements, to embody its conceptions in the most expressive and most harmonious forms. That this dialect is, in a great degree, of poetical formation, its own internal evidence betrays. Many of its most characteristic features originate in a tendency to adapt the structure of words to the exigencies of the hexameter verse, the earliest, and for long the only measure in which the Greek poets are known to have composed. This is a peculiarity foreign to the process by which languages are cultivated in our own age, or to what may appear, on first view, the natural process in any age. The generality of mankind do not discourse in verse; nor, therefore, does it seem likely that the mere fashion of the poets, in the choice of their numbers, should supersede the spontaneous flow of words dictated by the convenience of social intercourse. The phenomenon, however, is explained by a somewhat closer insight into the earlier stages of Greek literary culture. In all ages poets assume to themselves a certain privilege of varying the sound of words from that authorised by familiar usage. But, in a language yet unsettled, as was the Greek at this period, and where poetry was the only style of composition, not only is greater scope afforded for such license, but the variations themselves are more apt to become permanently

incorporated in the popular vocabulary. The case is different in more advanced stages of literature. Languages are there polished through the medium of prose composition. Poetry, indeed, there also asserts its own peculiar privilege. That privilege, however, now consists, not so much in innovation, as in adherence to antiquated forms; and, as a general rule, the language of poetry receives its laws from that of prose, upon which metrical usage cannot be said to exercise, in its turn, any serious influence. But, in the flourishing age of the Homeric dialect, prose, as a branch of literary composition, was unknown, while poetry was perhaps more universally popular than at any subsequent period. Under these circumstances, poetical usage could not fail to exercise an extensive influence even on the vulgar tongue, and numerous forms, originating in the convenience of popular recitation, to become inveterate in the language of ordinary life.[1] Nor is it in the old Ionic alone that this influence is observable. It may also be traced in other elementary stages of Greek poetry, where a particular branch of composition obtained a powerful hold on the popular mind. What first raised Athens to distinction in the republic of letters was the invention of the regular drama, in the dialogue of which the iambic trimeter verse, hitherto used chiefly in epigrammatic or didactic composition, was adopted, as a happy medium between the sonorous roundness of the heroic rhythm and the less defined periods of familiar discourse. There may, accordingly, be

[1] While, therefore, in more advanced stages of literature, poetical usage is the means of preserving archaic idioms, in primitive times it is the means of exploding them.

traced, in the formation of the classical Attic out of the old Ionic, an influence of the iambic measure, inferior, perhaps, in degree, but similar in kind, to that exercised by the hexameter some centuries before, in moulding the Ionic itself from the ruder speech of earlier times.

During the long separation of interests between the two bodies of the same Ionian race consequent on the Dorian revolution, the previous common dialect was subjected in each to other changes, offering an interesting analogy to those in their national character. In the Asiatic colonies many casuse conspired, not only to soften the ferocity of the old heroic spirit, but to diminish the sense of political independance, and promote effeminate habits. The enervating influence of Oriental luxury, with which they were brought into closer contact, was aided by a seductive climate, increase of commerce and wealth, and by their position in regard to the powerful nations of the interior, whose favour they were under the frequent necessity of courting, and towards whom they latterly stood on the footing of vassal to liege lord. The best criterion for judging of the parallel change in their language, during the interval between Homer and Herodotus, is a comparison of the dialect of the poet with that of the historian. In the former, the energy and simplicity of the heroes by whom it was spoken are tempered only by such harmony of numbers as was necessary to adapt it to the higher poetical style. In the latter, an accumulation of short and slender vowel sounds, with abbreviations of the more sonorous diphthongs, and the rejection of many of those lesser asperities which impart tone and vigour to a naturally melodious tongue, have superinduced a certain liquid

tenuity, amounting, at times, to languor, which renders it no less inferior to the old Homeric[1] as a poetical idiom, than to the Attic in its adaptation to prose literature.

Among the European descendants of the Ionian race, opposite causes produced as opposite effects. In Athens, with a less rapid advance in science or wealth, a complete political independance was accompanied by greater integrity of manners. The importance of that state, as a member of the old national confederacy, was also increased by the rivalry into which she was brought with the new Dorian dynasties. It was under these circumstances that the intellectual powers of the Athenians, naturally of the highest order, were called forth: combining acuteness of conception with fertility of invention and purity of taste, they exhibit, during the flourishing ages of the republic, all the proper excellences of Hellenic genius in the highest perfection. Similar were the changes in the antient common dialect. They consist, chiefly, in the retrenchment of redundancy, whether in sound or expression, in so far as was consistent with euphony on the one hand, and with perspicuity on the other.[2] The Attic dialect accordingly,

[1] Yet Herodotus, from his deference to the more manly Homeric standard, was considered a less faithful type of the pure Ionic than Hecatæus or Hippocrates. Hermog. de Formis Orat. II. 11.; Excerpt. ad calc. Greg. Corinth. de Diall. p. 679.

[2] Of that admixture of other less-cultivated dialects, or even foreign tongues, to which Xenophon (Rep. Attic. II. 8), and after him Thiersch and Matthiæ, ascribe the change from the old Ionic to the Attic, as little trace can be discovered in the classical standards of the latter dialect, as in those of the more recent Ionic. The changes in each case are solely, or chiefly, intrinsic. Hence Strabo (p. 333.), and with better reason no doubt, commends the Attic dialect for its purity, which he ascribes to the fewer temptations the rugged barren soil of Attica held out to the visits of strangers.

as finally formed upon these principles, offers the most excellent model of a language for the familiar usage of social life, or the more practical and intellectual branches of literature.

Somewhat parallel is the case of the Æolian tribes on the different sides of the Ægæan. The colonists of Lesbos, and of the neighbouring Æolian coast, united with the taste for sensual enjoyment common to their Ionian neighbours, a peculiar fervour and excitability of temperament. There sprang up among them, accordingly, a school of lyric poetry pre-eminent above all others in impassioned composition, especially that of the amatory or voluptuous order. The adaptation of their language to such subjects naturally involved a refinement of the old rustic features which it retained in the mother country. This was effected, with little sacrifice of its native simplicity, partly by softening down its ruder asperities, partly by an infusion of more liquid forms from the Homeric fountain head of pure poetical idiom.

Pervading influence of the Homeric dialect.

5. Although, in the course of these vicissitudes, the old poetical Ionic, as carried to perfection by Homer, became obsolete in vernacular usage, various circumstances combined to secure for it, as the common language of epic composition, an extensive influence on the culture of all the other dialects. In those districts of Greece where the late revolutions had not produced a total change of inhabitants, its ancient popularity continued to operate in its favour. Among the new settlers the same causes did not exist, or could not be expected to prove so efficient. The Dorians, inhabiting previously a remote frontier of Hellas, and little connected with the great body of the nation, had taken no part in the war of Troy, or in other

common enterprises of the Æolo-Ionian raees; nor, in their more limited sphere, does the same taste for legendary poetry appear to have prevailed among them. Still, however, as the spirit of local jealousy declined, in the mutual interchange of Hellenic associations, even the Spartans were not only led to recognise the poetical value of the Homeric dialect, but are said to have been the first among the states of European Greece to adopt the poems of Homer, in public use, as their standard text-book of heroic achievement.[1] It was a natural consequence of this early ascendancy of the Homeric idiom, as the sole language of literature, still more perhaps of the excellence of its models of style, that much of its phraseology should be infused into other branches of composition where different dialects were preferred. It continued accordingly, in all time coming, as the standard type of pure Hellenic diction, to exercise a most beneficial influence on the language at large. The rule which Macchiavel lays down for the renovation of states, and which is equally applicable to all other creations of human intellect, "to refer them to their first principles," was here in constant operation. The Ionic of Homer thus became a sort of common dialect, the forms of which, judiciously selected, impart dignity and variety to all the others. Although this influence is chiefly observable in poetical composition, it may yet be discerned by the critical eye, acting, less directly but no less advantageously, on the classical prose of every period.

6. This adaptation of the different dialects to literary purposes, keeping pace with the rise of new

The literary culture of the

[1] Aristot. ap. Heraclid. Polit. frg. 2. ed. Schneidewin; Plut. in Lycurg. 4.

separate dialects, a peculiarity of the Greek language.

styles of composition, is a peculiarity which distinguishes the literature of Greece from that of all other nations. The division into dialects is itself a feature common to the Greek with every other language spoken through an extensive region. Varieties of tribe, soil, or climate, must always tend in some degree to vary the mode of combining or pronouncing the same radical forms. In all other cases, however, in the annals at least of European literature, circumstances have led to the establishment of a single dialect of each tongue as the language of letters and polite society, the remainder being restricted to vulgar or provincial usage. In Greece the case was different. Each of the leading dialects there claimed and enjoyed the same advantage of literary culture. It will be proper here to examine the causes of this distinction, which has scarcely hitherto received such share of attention as its importance deserves.

Where a nation, speaking the same language under a variety of dialects, is united at the period of its first advance in civilisation in one body politic, the formation of a classical or court idiom results naturally from the necessity of a common medium for the promulgation of the laws, the distribution of justice, and the exercise of public oratory or military command. The preference awarded to a particular dialect is here usually to be sought in the influence of the seat of government, or in some other early moral or political superiority acquired by the tribe to whom it was originally proper. The political state of Greece at the period in question afforded no room for a preference of this nature. The nation was divided into many independent communities, with no

such predominance of any one state as could entail a corresponding ascendancy of its language. The case might have been different, for example, had the Pelopidan family, in the preceding period, succeeded in establishing a permanent sovereignty over any considerable portion of Greece. The poetical Ionic might then have become, and remained, the exclusive language of letters. The overthrow of the Pelopidan dynasty by the Dorians both checked the rising civilisation of Hellas, and dislocated the machinery by which its progress had hitherto been regulated. When, with the settlement of the new state of society, the process recommenced, the common spirit of Hellenic patriotism, though no way diminished throughout the mass of the nation, was more divided among its members, and more concentrated in each within the sphere of its local interests. This feeling of separate independance was heightened soon after by the abolition of monarchal power, and the establishment of republican institutions throughout the Hellenic states. In Europe the Spartans, Athenians, and other leading powers were actuated by a rivalry little short of what usually prevails between foreign nations. The Asiatic colonies formed distinct confederacies, but slightly connected with the mother country. Not only in these more important bodies politic, but in other flourishing commonwealths which successively arose in different corners of the Mediterranean, scope was now given for a spirit of individual nationality, to which no parallel can be found in any other age. The number of free citizens, who alone formed the state, was in each community but limited, and all were, by privilege and habit, per-

sonally engaged in the work of government. But the language was an essential portion of the state economy. The importance attached to the art of public speaking rendered its cultivation indispensable to whoever aspired to political eminence. The more popular branches of composition were also closely connected with religious solemnities, many of which were common to local Amphictionies, or confederacies of kindred states, assembling periodically in common sanctuaries for their celebration [1]; a practice contributing still further to individualise the cultivation of the local language and literature. All these circumstances, while they secured in each community the maintenance of its own dialect, tended to prevent that of any one attaining a marked ascendancy over its fellows. The abandonment of the mother tongue, and adoption of a foreign medium either of public or social intercourse, from deference to the superior power or talent of a neighbour, would have been a compromise of the national honour incompatible with the spirit which animated those republics. Another material cause of the same effect was the variety and extent of the national genius, coinciding with an equal variety of favourable media for its exercise. Among the moral influences above adverted to, as tending in other cases to promote the preference of some particular dialect in a national literature, the most important, perhaps, is the appearance, in some one province, of a number of writers whose genius and popularity have caused their works to be adopted as

[1] Thirlw. Hist. of Gr vol. II. ch. x. p. 427.; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. II. p. 321.

standards.[1] In Greece an extension of the same cause produced an opposite effect. As the different branches of composition were invented and matured, such was the fertility of native talent, that in different districts authors arose pre-eminent in some particular style. In this way, each member of the republic of letters, while willing to appreciate the genius of its neighbour, honourably maintained the independance of its own.

Appropriation of different dialects to different styles.

7. It resulted further, from the same causes, that as the sphere of literary pursuit was enlarged, the general rule of an exclusive preference of its native idiom by each community admitted of great modification. As the varieties of dialect were met by a corresponding variety of taste or talent, certain styles of composition came to be considered the more immediate province of one dialect than of another. The character of a particular dialect might be in itself better adapted to a particular style. The tribe by whom the dialect was spoken might have been that with whom the style itself originated, or whose authors were its most approved standards. Even local circumstances might procure for particular dialects a preference in subjects connected with the common public ceremonial of the confederacy. Hence different departments of literature ultimately established, out of so great a variety of materials, a mode of expression proper to themselves, without any compromise of patriotic feeling, or any sacrifice of the just rights of the mother tongue. The Doric became

[1] To this cause was owing the ascendancy of the Tuscan dialect in Italy, under the auspices of Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio. Here, however, the language of letters superseded in the other states of the peninsula was not the native tongue, but the barbarous Latin inherited from the lower ages of Rome.

the favourite language of the higher branches of lyric composition and of the primitive schools of philosophy; the Æolic of the amatory ode: the old Ionic retained its former privilege in regard to the epic style and hexameter verse; while the new Ionic and Attic were preferred in elegy, satire, the drama, and the more popular departments of prose.

Herodotus offers a lively example of the ease and freedom with which men of genius, in the youthful stages of Greek literature, followed the bent of their own judgement in the choice of a vehicle for their thoughts; a native of the Dorian Halicarnassus, settled in an Athenian colony founded at a period when the Attic dialect was already in a forward state of cultivation, he yet prefers the Ionic for the composition of his history. The reason is simple. The genius of his own Doric was little adapted for elegant prose; nor had the Attic as yet become popular in that style. Of the few prose authors who had hitherto treated the general history of Greece, the more popular were Ionians, so that the public was already familiar with their dialect in such subjects. Herodotus, therefore, not being ambitious of striking out any independant course of his own, preferred it. A few years afterwards Thucydides appeared, the first of a succession of illustrious Athenian prose writers; and, from this and other causes, the Attic soon obtained an almost universal preference in every branch of prose composition.

Artificial formation of new dialects for new styles.

8. As a consequence of the same principle which led to the adaptation of certain dialects to certain classes of writing, the whole body of dialects came to be considered as a common literary property; and men of inventive genius sought, by combining the characteristics of several, to enliven or ennoble their

favourite styles. In this way new varieties sprang up, distinct from the spoken language of any part of the nation. The Dorians, for example, at an early period, took a lead in the higher departments of choral poetry. Partly owing to this circumstance, partly to their local influence in the Olympian and other great national festivals, their dialect acquired a preference in the triumphal odes which graced those solemnities. The genius of the pure Doric, however, was deficient in the harmony essential to its poetical perfection. The leading authors, therefore, in this branch of composition, formed for themselves a new species of lyric dialect, by engrafting upon the Doric the more musical forms of the old Homeric. This is what is now called the Stesichorean or Pindaric. About the same period the chorus of the Dorian dithyramb, when transformed into that of the Athenian tragedy, underwent a similar modification, by a blending with the native Attic. Hence another beautiful variety of poetical idiom. So delicate was the sympathy established in the subsequent refinements of Attic taste between idea and sound, that even the different turns of expression, in the same departments of composition, were marked by corresponding shades of dialectical form. When, for example, in the drama, messengers are introduced recounting at length the details of remarkable events, where, consequently, the dramatic gives place in some degree to the epic character, the usual Attic idiom and Iambic measure admit of forms peculiar to the Homeric dialect and hexameter verse as the proper language and rhythm of narrative poetry.[1] Even in

[1] Matthiæ, Gramm. vol. i. § 16. p. 63., § 160. p. 297. Hence many of the supposed corrections of these passages, by Porson and others, are in all probability corruptions.

the mixed idiom of the chorus may be distinguished a greater infusion of Æolo-Doric forms where the train of sentiment assumes a loftier character, and of Attic where a more familiar tone prevails.[1]

By this varied application of its rich stock of materials, the Greek language afforded a freedom and scope to the exercise of literary genius, to which nothing parallel can be found in any other age or country. A language restricted to one definite classical standard can hardly be well adapted to every class of composition. The same musical softness which favours the flow of poetical numbers must, in a proportional degree, be prejudicial to the gravity of historical narrative and philosophical disquisition, or to the terseness of forensic eloquence. Had Demosthenes possessed no other medium for giving vent to his Philippics but the Ionic of Homer, or Plato composed his Republic in the Æolic of Sappho, their works, whatever their intrinsic excellence, must have sacrificed a portion of their external charm to the comparatively inappropriate dress in which they would have appeared. This may be further illustrated by the example of modern nations distinguished for talent in every department of letters. The French tongue has produced a comic writer equal, to say the least, to the chiefs of the Attic humorous drama: but, in the higher walks of poetry, neither genius nor art can overcome the obstacles to a corresponding degree of excellence interposed by the sound and structure of that language. The finest conceptions couched in harsh or discordant accents can no more constitute perfection in poetry,

[1] Elmsl. ad Eurip Med. 95.; Matthiæ ad Eurip. Hecub. 95.

than in music the sublimest airs sung by a weak and tuneless voice. The same general remark applies more or less to all the other European tongues, that, in proportion as they may be adapted to one style of composition, they are unfavourable to another. But in the cultivated Greek dialects we possess the masterpieces of several languages rather than of one. It were difficult to imagine a vehicle of expression better suited to the varied powers of the Epic muse, than the old Homeric; to the tenderness of amatory complaint, than the Lesbian Æolic; to the mingled gravity and impetuosity of the triumphal lyre, than the Doric of Pindar: or to the precision and energy of dialogue, prose narrative, and oratory, than the Attic of Aristophanes, Thucydides, and Demosthenes.

Ultimate ascendancy of the Attic dialect.

9. The above remarks apply chiefly to the flourishing ages of Greece, when a spirit of independance animated the institutions of every state, and the breast of every citizen. With the decline of the national character, the establishment of a dominant influence in the political commonwealth was attended, as in other ages and countries, by a corresponding effect in the republic of letters. The preponderance of Attic genius had procured a certain ascendancy to the Attic tongue, even prior to the subjection of Greece to the Macedonians. One great object of this semibarbarous power, from its first rise into importance, was to establish a claim to the pure Hellenic character, and, by consequence, to promote Hellenic habits and associations among its subjects. As the most effectual means of attaining this end, they adopted the Attic as the court dialect, took the literature and science of Athens under their espe-

cial patronage, and established them as models in the new schools founded under their own auspices. Alexandria thus became the metropolis of arts and letters, and the Attic, as it prevailed in that court, slightly modified by provincial peculiarities, the classical dialect of the whole Hellenic world. The other dialects, however, were not entirely abandoned. The old Ionic maintained its exclusive preference in heroic poetry. Nor did the existence of such models as Herodotus or Pindar fail to secure a certain number of followers in the branches to which they had given lustre. Still, however, the use of all the older dialects became, from day to day, more a matter of imitation than of spontaneous custom.

Sicilian Doric.

The states which longest maintained a political independance were the Sicilian republics. The Macedonian sway, to which the whole of Greece Proper, with her colonies to the eastward, had been more or less subjected, never extended to those commonwealths. Perhaps, indeed, their most flourishing age was that of the decline of the mother country. Their literary history supplies, accordingly, another illustration of the close union between the destinies of the Greek language and of Greek national independance. It was during this period, when Sicily in fact stood alone as the representative of the original genius of Hellas, that her poets carried to perfection, as its last expiring effort, one of its liveliest and most characteristic creations, the pastoral or bucolic style of lyric poetry, and with it another spirited variety of the Doric dialect.

CHAP. VII.

ORIGINAL GENIUS OF GRECIAN LITERATURE.

1. UNITY OF GENIUS BETWEEN THE GREEK NATION AND ITS LANGUAGE. — 2. ESSENTIAL DIFFERENCE IN THE ORIGIN OF HELLENIC AND MODERN LITERARY CULTURE. — 3. ADVANTAGES ON THE SIDE OF THE GREEKS. — 4. ORIGINALITY AND FERTILITY OF GREEK INVENTIVE GENIUS. — 5. FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF IDEAL EXCELLENCE IN GREEK COMPOSITION. — 6. CLASSICAL AND ROMANTIC SCHOOLS OF MODERN COMPOSITION. — 7. SUPERIOR EXTENT AND VARIETY OF MODERN LITERARY CULTURE.

Unity of genius between the Greek nation and its language.

1. The influence of the same causes which promoted the culture of the separate dialects may be traced on the language at large, in rendering it as faithful a reflexion of the genius of the whole nation as each dialect was of that of the individual tribe. The distinction between the language of letters and the vulgar tongue, so characteristic of modern civilisation, is imperceptible or but little defined in the flourishing age of Greece. Numerous peculiarities in her social condition tended to constitute classical expression in speaking or writing, not, as with us, the privilege of a few, but a public property in which every Hellene had an equal interest. Among these peculiarities may be especially noticed the freedom of social intercourse which prevailed among all ranks of citizens, owing partly to their republican institutions, partly to their natural vivacity of temper and devotion to public amusements, of which literature formed an important element; the industrial arts being chiefly confined to slaves, and attendance on the council, theatre, or gymnasia the only occupations suitable to

the dignity of a Hellenic freeman. During many ages, oral recitation, in the absence or limited use of writing, was the sole or chief, at every period a common, mode of publication. Works of genius, even of the highest order, were addressed, not to an exclusive class, but to the citizens at large; were recited on solemn occasions, and often approved or condemned by the voice of the assembled multitude. To this popularity of the national literature may be ascribed in great part that richness and freedom of expression, which constitutes so great a charm of the Greek writers of the best period. In the choice of their phrases, they were guided rather by their innate sense of euphony and propriety, than by deference to any artificial standard. Whatever was custom, was equally entitled to become rule. Not that critical discrimination was excluded, but the rejection of a word or phrase merely as a vulgarism, without reference to its intrinsic merit, could hardly, in the nature of things, take place in the flourishing ages of Greek letters. Much of this variety of expression, in the syntactic element of the language, may be traced to that ascendancy of the imaginative faculty which marks the earlier stages of literary culture. An author, warmed by his subject, expressed his ideas in the order in which they spontaneously offered themselves, without arresting their flow to consider how far that order was strictly grammatical. Nor, had he himself observed the irregularity, would he have deemed its correction an improvement, satisfied that the train of association in the mind of the audience would harmonise so nearly with his own, that they would be as little disposed to cavil as he to amend.

The elementary rules of grammatical concordance are everywhere substantially the same. If, therefore, the structure of each language were regulated by strict laws of analogy, there would be little or no scope for variety, in connecting the ideas of which words are the representatives. It is, in a great measure, through the anomalies of syntax, that the working of thought in the individual or national mind is exhibited. But this shadowing forth of individual character is an important element of spirit and originality of style, which must be extinguished by any systematic reduction of popular usage to grammatical analogy. Against the danger of freedom degenerating into license or obscurity, native Greek taste proved an effectual safeguard. It is this inexhaustible diversity of modes of expression, the analysis and classification of which, under the technical heads of Ellipsis, Pleonasm, Anacoluthia, Syncope, and so forth, have exercised the ingenuity of grammarians for the last two thousand years, but which can no more be reduced to any fixed rules than the varied intelligence in which they originate.

Different origin of Hellenic and modern literary culture.

2. These peculiarities of the Greek tongue are traceable mainly, no doubt, to the genius of the people, partly however to the difference, formerly pointed out, in the circumstances under which Hellenic and modern literary culture took their origin. The former arose in the bosom of the nation, and was matured by the unaided efforts of native genius. Its standards of taste were the produce of the talents common to all, not of the educational acquirements peculiar to a few. Numerous masterpieces in the higher walks of poetry had been composed before the familiar use of prose writing, and the most esteemed

models of both styles before the first attempts to reduce grammar to system. This process was reserved for a period when original talent was already on the decline, and professed critics attempted, by giving uniformity to classical usage, to check the progress of corruption. In the other European languages, from the Latin downwards, this order was reversed. Their culture was, from the first, carried on upon imitative principles. In the one case the rules were derived from the standards; in the other, the standards were framed after the rules. The classic literature of Rome originated with native Greeks, and the Latin language was cultivated by reference to the laws of Greek grammar and prosody. The first step taken, on the revival of taste in our own middle ages, for refining the "vulgar tongue" (as the spoken language was called, in contradistinction to the barbarous Latin of the schools), was to apply to its productions the rules devised by the antient sophists for sustaining the decrepitude of the classical dialects. Its more advanced stages of culture have been the result of a long course of artificial training and careful separation of the classical from the vernacular phraseology. Many modes of expression, calculated to impart energy and variety to style, and to which the Greek dialects would have given full prominence, have been proscribed by the tyranny of grammatical criticism as inelegant, or lie hid as vulgarisms in the provincial idiom. Our literary dialects may be compared to gardens of select plants, many of them exotics, nurtured by scientific training, and carefully separated from the wild growths by which they are surrounded. The Greek language may be likened to an extensive pleasure-ground in a favoured climate

and diversified soil, comprising every species of wild and domestic vegetation in endless variety and luxurianee.

The equal distribution of literary culture among all classes of Greek citizens was also favoured by the originality of their language, above noticed as one of its most important attributes. The etymology of its words being, with rare exeeption, contained within itself, the terms which represent even complex ideas connected with the more abstruse sciences were reducible, by a more or less consistent train of analogy, to certain elementary roots, conveying through their sound some general apprehension of their sense to the understanding of the least learned. But in mixed or corrupt languages, such as most of those of modern Europe, a large portion of the vocabulary can convey, to the majority of persons who use it, no more definite impression than results from the habitual association of a certain sound with a certain idea, which would, to them, have been equally well represented by any other sound. No Italian or Frenchman can possess a scholarlike knowledge of his own tongue, but through a familiarity with the Latin; no Englishman, but through an acquaintance with Latin, French, and German. In each case, a nearer insight into the native etymology requires also some tincture of Greek letters. The language of modern science is, to all but the accomplished linguist, a species of cabalistic dialect, in its origin chiefly Greek, and mainly dependant on that tongue for its further developement. In Greece, on the other hand, every man that could read and write possessed all the elementary education requisite to enable him, according to his talent and opportunities, to tread at

once the higher walks of literature, or dive into the mysteries of science.

Advantages on the side of the Greeks.

3. The literature, like the language, thus grew up from infancy to maturity, a vivid reflexion of the genius of the people. That pedantry of scholastic learning and spirit of imitation which pervade our own republic of letters were completely excluded. The national taste alone prompted the various branches of composition, which arose, were matured and subdivided, with the parallel stages of ethic and social developement. Their materials were drawn from purely national sources. The vicissitudes of domestic history furnished a copious store of subjects in which every Hellene had a personal interest, and a varied mythology repaid the fancy to which it owed its own birth with an imagery as richly varied. Among the advantages resulting from this union between the genius of the nation and of its literature was that close sympathy between author and subject, so essential to excellence in every branch of art. Let us imagine two poets of equal talent, each charged with the composition of an ode in celebration of a glorious victory; the one a citizen of the triumphant state, who had borne a part in the war, the other a foreigner, who had heard of the adventure but by distant report. There can be little doubt which of the two poems would be most distinguished by poetic fire. The rule applies more or less to every other popular class of composition, and extends from the author to the audience, who enter far more readily into a subject founded on domestic history or manners, than one borrowed from nations of whose habits or language they know nothing but through historical or antiquarian re-

search. Nor is the influence of this association limited to the age in which a composition appears, or the public to whom it is addressed. A work, either of history or fiction, emanating from the country and times in which the scene of action is laid, acquires a far greater hold on the public, even of other times and regions, than one by a foreigner on the same subject. No history of the Persian or Peloponnesian war, by a modern author, can awaken the same interest as the narratives of Herodotus or Thucydides. In poetry this power of association is still stronger. The supernatural agency of classical fable delights in the page of the native writers, because we feel that, however foreign to our own belief, it represents that, real or poetical, of the author, his heroes, and his public. In a modern poem on classical subjects it becomes comparatively insipid, because, though in unison with the belief of the heroes, it is foreign to that of the author or his public. But the same heathen mythology, in a modern adventure, not only fails to warm, but actually freezes the imagination, because we feel that it is equally foreign to the belief of the author, his heroes, and his public.[1] It is in the literature of Greece

[1] So powerful is the influence of this affection, as to cause much to be admired, through its medium, as excellent, or even sublime, which would otherwise be stigmatised as affectation or bombast. It was chiefly, or solely, because the Ossianic poems were held to be the productions of a barbarous Celt of the third century, that they were once so highly esteemed; it is because they are now believed to be a patchwork by a Scottish bookmaker of the eighteenth, that they have been consigned to neglect. Their actual merits or demerits, as poetical compositions, are the same in each case; it is the association in the public mind alone that has altered. Hence, too, as will be more fully pointed out hereafter, the satisfaction with which we pursue in Homer those minute descriptions of the transactions of ordinary life which would be insufferable in an epic poem of the present day.

alone, among the nations of civilised Europe, that the full power of this association is perceptible. No study of foreign history was there required to create or appreciate the higher works of genius, no deference to foreign rules of criticism, no initiation into the mysteries of a mythological machinery transferred by the labours of the antiquary from remote ages to a state of society at variance with its spirit. A Roman, in order to understand the elegant authors in his own tongue, required to be more deeply versed in the annals of Greece than of his own country. In the present age the sphere of acquirement necessary to form an accomplished man of letters has been still more widely extended, and many of the noblest productions of modern literature are uninteresting or unintelligible to all but the upper rank of educated men.[1]

[1] Of the value of this source of interest in a national literature few modern nations seem to have had any clear conception. The subject, which with the Greeks was the soul of the action, has in our own age been too often considered but as a species of raw material for the art of the dramatic experimentalist. It is like the block of marble, out of which the modern sculptor, with an equal neglect of the spirit of Greek art, and an equally servile adherence to its practice, hews Apollos, Mercuries, Ariadnes, instead of applying the principles transmitted through the antique models to the execution of national works. Hence that pedantic reproduction of Medeas, Meropes, Phædras; where the question with the author or the critic is, not so much whether the work be calculated to speak home to the feelings of the audience, as how far the poet can claim to have successfully competed with Euripides or Racine in the art of adjusting dramatic combinations. Shakspeare uttered a happy, though involuntary, satire on the classical European drama, in his famous lines,

> "What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba,
> That he should weep for her."

There can, indeed, be as little tragic sympathy between the benches of a Parisian pit and the distresses of a Hippolytus or Antigone, as between the polished boots and starched cravat of the audience, and the diadem, buskin, and chlamys of the performers.

Originality and fertility of Greek inventive genius.

4. Whatever difference of opinion, therefore, may exist as to the essential value of antient and modern learning, the claim of Greece to originality and extent of spontaneous invention is unquestionable and paramount. To her belongs the exclusive honour of creating and maturing a system of literary polity for civilised Europe; of having originated, classed, and regulated the various departments of composition; and furnished, in each, standards, by the study of which the efforts of every people who have since successfully cultivated the elegant arts have been awakened, or their progress directed. In no other country has any advance been made towards the higher stages of excellence independently of Greek models, or of the impulse communicated directly or indirectly by Greeks. Were it, therefore, proposed as a point of speculative inquiry, whether, had the Hellenic nation never existed, or had its works of genius been annihilated on the rise of the Roman ascendancy, the present dominant races of Europe would have stood higher in the scale of literary culture than the other nations of antiquity before their subjection to Hellenic influence, the decision, if referred to the test of experience, must be in the negative. This may at first view seem a startling conclusion. When we consider the actual extent and variety of our intellectual resources, so far surpassing those of the antients in their most enlightened epochs, they appear so entirely our own, that, even admitting the whole fabric to rest on a Hellenic foundation, the consciousness of our existing superiority might still incline us to assume that, in the absence of all foreign aids, the spontaneous efforts of modern genius would have attained a similar emi-

nence; and that too without any sacrifice of native originality at the shrine of classical antiquity. "The advantage of the Greeks," it might be urged, "is to be ascribed rather to the favour of destiny, which allotted to them a primary, to ourselves a secondary, stage in the march of improvement, than to an innate superiority of inventive talent. Our own civilisation being thus grounded on a previous social system, the adoption of the models transmitted by it became unavoidable." The question, however, arises: How happens it that the same nations, who, after coming into contact with Greek art and science, displayed taste and talent for their cultivation, should not have spontaneously put forth that talent in their previous independant capacity? On behalf of our Teutonic ancestors, there may reasonably be pleaded their comparative remoteness from the older fountain heads of elementary civilisation, and the absence of other local advantages enjoyed by the countries on the Mediterranean. Another case, however, more immediately in point, is that of the Romans, through whose medium chiefly Greek science has been distributed to the rest of Europe. The example of this distinguished people shows that a high amount of attainment in legislation, agriculture, and the essentially useful arts, has no necessary connexion with elegant pursuit; and that nations who, when supplied with a first story, may be qualified to raise excellent fabrics, would have been incompetent themselves to rear them from the foundation. Rome was mistress of a great empire, had attained the climax of her social prosperity, and a proficiency in all the practical arts of life, before a single native fruit of her imaginative talent can be adduced above the rank of

the popular ballads common to all semibarbarous tribes. It required a familiarity with the classical models of Greece, consequent on the subjugation of that country, to engraft on a naturally barren stock the nobler productive powers which were indigenous among the Greeks; and the first improvers of Latin style were naturalised Hellenes. But the races who have since held sway in Europe can hardly lay claim to any innate superiority of taste or genius over those of antient Italy. If the Romans showed such incapacity to advance without the aid of the Greeks, under circumstances little less favourable than those in which the Greeks did every thing for themselves, we can have no right to assume that the barbarians who overran the Roman empire, if equally left to themselves, would have done more than the Romans. In both cases there is the same deficiency of native resources, with the same disposition to respond to the stimulus when applied from the proper quarter. Hence the remarkable contrast, that while it is even now matter of dispute whether the most illustrious Greek poets, whose works still form the acknowledged standards of the art of composition, so much as knew the use of letters, the restorers of literature in modern times were men of profound classical learning.

Principles of ideal excellence in Greek composition.

5. The principles of ideal beauty in art or literature, though founded on certain primary laws of harmony and propriety, have no separate existence in themselves, apart from the works in which they are embodied, and which an approved excellence has caused to be adopted as models. Nor is the observance of those principles in individual cases essential to excellence. Power of expression and originality of conception, even under rudely digested forms, still possess

their value. Literary merit accordingly, in this general sense, is far from being peculiar to Greece, or to writers on whom the influence of Greek culture is perceptible. We find much to admire in the literature of various other antient races, of the Hebrews for example, or the Indians; but we reject their compositions as models for ourselves. The masterpieces of the Greeks, on the other hand, are appreciated, not only for their individual excellence, but for the elementary laws of art which they embody. Further evidence of the exclusively Hellenic origin of these laws exists in the fact, that while they are acknowledged by the reason or critical discernment of other nations, they are not, as a general rule, congenial to their taste. Hence the modern authors most distinguished for originality and power are those who have least conformed to them. Thus Milton is more chaste but less original than Dante, Tasso than Ariosto, Racine than Shakspeare, Canova than Michel Angelo.[1] It is only where, in the same individual or the same people, the dictates of natural taste lead to a spontaneous coincidence, that both elements of perfection can be united. Among the Greeks alone this happy union is to be found, for their purest standards of style are also their noblest productions of original genius.

The question may here naturally occur: What are those elementary principles of ideal excellence, in-

[1] The illustration may be extended from literature to the graphic departments of elegant art. Among various other nations, where Hellenic example never spread, the efforts of indigenous talent have produced, in these departments also, works of great excellence, counterbalanced, however, by anomalies and defects destructive of their value as standard models. The Greek school of design is the only one which has grown up, under the guidance of pure native genius, in spontaneous conformity with the principles of ideal beauty and propriety.

digenous in Greece, exotics in all other regions? They consist in the just blending of force and elegance, of symmetry and variety; in the adaptation to the several departments of composition, in prose or verse, of their proper style, limits, and class of subjects, so as to avoid the opposite extremes of meagreness or diffuseness, or the offensive collision of heterogeneous elements. They require, especially in works of a higher class, that happy relation of parts and unity of whole, which alone can insure grandeur of effect; order and perspicuity in the general distribution of the subject; and a just mixture of conciseness and amplitude in the details. In poetry they consist in that triple rule, so finely laid down by Milton, that it should be "simple, sensuous, passionate," in idealising its subjects, without sacrifice of their truth and reality; in the distinction between elevation and bombast, fervour and extravagance, in the ebullitions of passion; between richness and profusion in embellishment or imagery. These excellencies may often be found individually exemplified in the productions of nations to whom the influence of Greek culture has not extended; but never united, still less reduced to system, by the spontaneous practice of native authors and the approval of the native public.

Throughout the above remarks, a distinction has been made between the terms Principles and Rules. While in the elegant arts, as in justice and morality, there are certain fundamental laws, of universal application, the particular rules in each case may, and ought, to vary with the difference of time, place, and circumstance. However excellent may be the principles inculcated in the Greek standards, as their

substance resolves itself into a general observance of propriety, it follows that an adherence to any specific rule or practice of Greek art, where the circumstances in which it originated no longer obtain, may be in as plain opposition to Greek principles, as the wildest aberrations of barbaric genius. A servile adherence to the letter rather than the spirit of antient usage has been productive, accordingly, of many injurious effects in modern literature. For example, the principles of tragic composition transmitted by the Greeks are: that the subject should be dignified in itself, and possess a hold on the sympathies of the audience; that the characters should be conceived in the spirit of the age and state of society from which they are derived; that the action should be perspicuous and united, not overloaded with personages or incidents; and that grotesque admixtures of heterogeneous materials should be avoided. These are laws invariable in themselves, and applicable to the higher class of dramatic composition in every country. The specific rules of Greek tragedy, on the other hand, the rigid adherence to the unities of time and place, the preference of mythological subjects, the employment of a chorus, and others connected with peculiarities, social or religious, under which the Greek drama was matured, have been found inept or incongruous on the modern stage.

Classical and romantic schools of modern composition.

6. It has been customary, in certain recent schools of criticism, to justify the irregularities of great modern writers, as reflecting the genius of the age or country in which they flourished. As a general rule, no doubt, literary works must be judged with reference to the circumstances under which they were produced. But this rule is subject, like

others, to exception, or it would strike at the root of all critical distinction. What is in itself faulty may be palliated, but can never become excellent by any force of circumstances. The same law applies in literature and art as in morals or politics. What would be enormities in the conduct of an English gentleman might hardly provoke censure in an Arab sheikh or a Turkish aga. In like manner, the inflated style which we call Oriental is congenial to the taste and character of the Eastern nations; and this, by imparting to it a certain interest of association, renders it less offensive than in European literature: but no such consideration can ever render it an excellence; otherwise the quaint doggerel of the middle age chronicle might contest the palm with the narrative of Hume or Robertson. In the same critical school, modern composition has been divided into two branches, under the titles of classical and romantic. The characteristics of the former are defined as a greater or less adherence to the Aristotelian unities, with a general preference of subjects or imagery borrowed from antient history or mythology. The romantic style, on the other hand, derives its materials from modern history, or treats them rather according to the dictates of national taste than to theoretical rules of propriety. The distinction is in itself ingenious and well founded. Not so, however, the inference with which it is usually coupled: that the Principles by which each style is, or ought to be, guided are different; as if there were a species of literary excellence essentially distinct from what the Greeks have taught us. The principles of Hellenic art are of universal application, to the literature of Italy or Spain, of France or of

England; and, however the admirers of the romantic school may profess to disregard or repudiate them, still, if its own productions be impartially tested by them, its merits will be found to be in unison, its defects as surely at variance, with what they inculcate.[1]

For example, the properties to be chiefly admired in the romantic drama, subjects derived from indigenous sources, spirited portraiture of character, and vivid representation of passion and feeling, are all in strict harmony with the laws of classical composition. Its defects, again, the little regard for unity of action, and entire contempt for that of time or place; the confusion of incidents, inconsistencies of geography or chronology, and burlesque admixture of the serious and ludicrous, are plain violations of the laws, not merely of Hellenic, but of all elegant art. While, on the other hand, the merits of the modern classical drama consist chiefly in the absence of those blemishes which disfigure its rival, its own defects are owing mainly to a slavish observance of the letter, in breach of the spirit, of the rules by which it professes to be guided.

Superior extent and variety of modern literary culture.

7. The literary historian must not, however, be led, by any partiality for his own subject, to underrate the intellectual culture of other times, as compared with that which it is his immediate province to treat. Nor, certainly, is such the object,

[1] It is worthy of remark, in further illustration of what has been said, that the chiefs of the Spanish school of romantic poetry, whose productions combine perhaps the greatest originality and fire with the most extravagant license, have themselves recorded their testimony to the essential value of the chaster classic standards, coupled with a confession of inability to conform to them. Their judgement was convinced, their imagination refused obedience. Sismondi, Lit. du Midi, vol. III. p. 366.

or, if rightly estimated, the general tendency, of the above remarks. The distinguishing characteristics of an age or nation cannot be fully appreciated but by the contrast of parallel cases, in which the same phenomena are either wanting or exhibited in a different form. We have hence been led to compare the fundamental features of Hellenic literature, its purity and originality, with the equally fundamental feature of modern culture, its spirit of imitation. But this advantage on the side of the Greeks, is well counterbalanced by the superiority of our own state of society in amount and variety of attainment: nor can there be a stronger proof how finely the springs which regulate the progress of human events work together, than the fact, that to the absence of those very causes which operated so favourably in the case of the Hellenes much of that superiority may be traced. The same exclusive national feeling, and conscious intellectual power, which concentrated and sharpened the inventive faculties of the Greeks, by leading them, at the same time, to contemn all other nations as barbarians, tended to stifle or to blunt that zeal for historical research which might otherwise have been expected from their acute and speculative disposition. On the other hand, the very obligation under which the modern nations were placed, in rearing their own social fabric on a classical basis, to study other tongues, and investigate the affairs of other countries and ages, has been the primary scource of that enlargement of ideas which distinguishes our literary culture from the exclusive system of the Greeks. To this obligation is due, more especially, the spirit of enlightened philological pursuit, altogether peculiar to modern times, the bene-

fits of which, in every department of science, are incalculable. The invidious line of distinction between Greek and Barbarian has been succeeded by the establishment of one great intellectual commonwealth; the subdivision of which into separate provinces, differing in language and political interests, but united by a common zeal in the pursuit of knowledge has produced effects in Europe at large analogous to those above traced in Hellas to the subdivision of her tribes and dialects. It has fomented a spirit of enlightened rivalry, where all are as anxious to excel as ready to rejoice in the success of others. Scientific investigation has been directed into new channels entirely shut up from the antients; and the lives of large classes of men, with large portions of national wealth, are devoted to the cultivation of the language, literature, and arts, not only of Greece and Rome, but of every other nation with which geographical discovery or antiquarian research has made us acquainted.

Each state of society, therefore, has its own proper privileges and advantages, and those which the present enjoys are undoubtedly greater and more varied than ever fell to the lot of any other: a purer system of religion and morals, clearer views of the rights and liberties of man, and a far greater proficiency in all the arts of real utility or necessity. Contented with these our just claims to preeminence, we may safely concede to the Greeks those which, with equal right, appertain to them: originality of inventive genius, purity of taste, and an intuitive perception of the beautiful and the sublime in imaginative art, peculiar to themselves among the nations either of antient or modern times.

CHAP. VIII.

MYTHICAL POETS AND WORKS.

1. ORIGIN AND EARLY CULTIVATION OF THE ART OF POETRY.—2. THRACE AND THRACIANS OF THE MYTHICAL AGE. PIERIA. DAULIA. HELICON. NYSA.—3. LEGENDARY MINSTRELS. AMPHION.—4. ORPHEUS. PHILAMMON. THAMYRIS.—5. EUMOLPUS. MUSÆUS. PAMPHOS. LINUS.—6. OLEN. OLYMPUS.—7. FABULOUS MINSTRELSY OF GREECE CHIEFLY CONNECTED WITH THE RITES OF DEMETER AMD DIONYSUS. EARLY ASCENDANCY OF ÆOLIAN GENIUS. ACCREDITED WORKS OF THIS PERIOD.

Origin and early cultivation of the art of poetry.

1. THAT metrical composition should have preceded prose by several centuries in Greece may, on first view, appear a reversal of the natural order of invention. The more simple and spontaneous mode of expression ought, it might seem, to take precedence of the more studied and complicated. Experience, however, proves the contrary to have been the case wherever the progress of literary culture has remained free from external or artificial influences; and a little reflexion will show that such is the natural course of things. The faculties through which literary talent is exercised or appreciated are twofold, the Fancy and the Judgement; the former of which is always in the ascendant in the primitive stages of society. Literary productions therefore, in order to command the attention of a simple people, must entertain and excite rather than instruct. But the language of colloquial discourse possesses in itself no peculiar charm; and that refinement of it which constitutes elegant prose, with the taste for its enjoyment, belongs to a more advanced stage of social culture. To cap-

tivate the fancy alone, it has been found necessary to embellish the language of common life, by combining the ideal dignity of expression and sentiment which constitutes the substance of poetry, with the harmonious cadence of metrical numbers which constitutes its form.

But, in the infancy of society, other circumstances conspired to render rhythm not only an agreeable, but an essential element of popular composition. The essence of all literature is permanence. Without this, the highest efforts of genius in prose or verse were mere transitory effusions, like the fireside tale of wonder, or the burst of occasional oratory to which excited feelings give vent in the ordinary intercourse of life. When preserved and transmitted, those efforts first assume the character of literary monuments. But, even if prose composition were to the taste of a barbarous age, its transmission, by the aid of memory alone, would be scarcely possible, or would require an exertion to which no primitive people could be expected to submit. Rhythm, on the other hand, both facilitates the task of committing to memory, and affords such aid to the powers of retention, as to supply the place of writing in the absence or little prevalence of that art. Hence it will be found that, among all barbarous nations, the first literary productions are of the metrical order: whether hymns in praise of their gods, or epic poems recording the genealogy and exploits of their heroes.

Poetry then is the basis of all intellectual culture. It is the first step by which our nature raises itself above the physical impulses to which we are subject in common with the lower order of creation, the first attempt to embody thought in a connected and

permanent form; and it were difficult, probably, to discover any race of men so nearly on a level with the brutes, that some species of ballad or song has not been current among them. The origin of this art therefore, among the Greeks, may be considered as coëval with their existence. Its higher cultivation, however, can only be dated from the epoch when the establishment of Hellenic ascendancy had imparted consistency and permanence to a national language, and provided subjects calculated to awaken a nobler vein of poetical inspiration.

Every art, in its earliest state, must be assumed to exist in its simplest form, and limited to its most elementary objects. The simplest forms of the poetical art are the Epic and Lyric; the one describing the actions, the other descanting on the praises of the objects celebrated. Attention will be directed to the special properties of each, and their respective claims to priority or importance, in connexion with the more strictly historical period of their cultivation, where the existence of real works and authors offers tangible material for commentary. The poems of either class which the Greek legends ascribed to the primitive bards were chiefly of a religious tendency. It seems, however, more probable, that in this, as in every subsequent period, human affairs supplied the principal subjects of celebration. A few Pæans, or sacrifical hymns, would suffice for the service of the deity or his altars; but the calls of human vanity would be less easily satisfied. Those legends may, however, possess historical value, as figurative of that union between poetry and priesthood which characterises all primeval civilisation. Poetry was not only the vehicle by which invocations were addressed to the gods, and

oracular edicts, or moral and religious maxims to the people, but was itself considered a species of divine inspiration. While, therefore, poets were likely to become priests and prophets, men of superior intellect would, even where not naturally favoured by the Muses, be led to cultivate the poetical art, as a means of securing influence over their fellow-citizens. Music and poetry were also, among the primitive Greeks, inseparably connected. Hence, in their traditions, the character of poet is usually found to combine those of musician, priest, prophet, and sage. Even in the more recent historical form in which it appears in the page of Homer, the office of bard is identified on some occasions with that of sage or counsellor.[1]

Thrace and Thracians of the mythical age.

2. Several of the earliest and most celebrated of these gifted personages, Orpheus, Thamyris, Eumolpus, and others, are in the popular legend designated Thracians. To this account, taken by the letter, as referring to the nation familiarly bearing that title, importance has been attached by the school of critics who derive all the elementary civilisation of Greece from foreign sources. On the admission that these minstrels really were Thracians in the above sense, we must assume, as essential to the performances recorded of them, either that Thrace was formerly inhabited by a Greek population, or that the poets themselves, if foreigners, possessed a perfect knowledge of the Greek tongue. In the former case their foreign origin would consist but in name. The latter view, on the other hand, coupled with the extensive influence ascribed to them, would imply a great superiority of the Thracians of those days over the Hellenes in elementary culture.

[1] Odyss. γ. 267.

That a few solitary individuals, travelling into a foreign land, should have thoroughly mastered its language, and founded a national school of poetry and music, were scarcely credible, unless the arts which they taught had already reached a comparatively advanced stage in their own country. But the whole tenor of authentic history repudiates the notion of any such precocity among the indigenous tribes of Thrace. They were, in every historical age, a proverbially barbarous people, and their language a barbarous tongue, with as little pretension to literature as they themselves to taste for its cultivation. It seems incredible therefore that the Hellenes, a people surpassing all others in brilliancy of inventive genius, could have been indebted for the improvement of their own language, and the first rudiments of the art of composition, to a foreign race who were never able to advance a step in the same direction at home. These considerations tend to destroy the whole value of the popular accounts, taking the terms Thrace and Thracian in their familiar sense.

Pieria.

Among the more plausible attempts to solve the difficulty is the hypothesis, that the Thrace alluded to in these fables was the district of Pieria, situated on the north, or Macedonian side of Mount Olympus, and in so far comprehended within the limits of Thrace in the wider sense of the term.[1] This district, bordering on the sanctuary of the Hellenic Jove, and a favourite seat of Apollo and the Muses, may reasonably be supposed to have been possessed in these times by a Hellenic population, spreading over both sides of the divine

[1] Müll. Proleg. zu ein. w. Myth. p. 219.; Orchom., 2d ed. p. 372. sqq.

Daulia. Helicon.

mountain. But the case admits of another, and perhaps more satisfactory explanation. It is certain that, in the mythical geography, a tract of country on the frontiers of Bœotia and Phocis, comprehending Mounts Parnassus and Helicon, bore the name of Thrace. In this region the popular mythology also lays the scene of several of the most celebrated adventures the heroes of which are called Thracians. In the fable of Itys and Philomela, Tereus, king of Thrace, marries Procne, daughter of Pandion king of Athens: but his court and palace, with the tragical events that followed, are placed in Phocis. On this apparent anomaly Thucydides, in allusion to an Odrysian chief of his own time, called Teres, has the following commentary[1]: "This Teres has no connexion whatever with the Tereus who married Pandion's daughter, nor were they natives of the same Thrace; for the antient Tereus dwelt in Daulia, in the country now called Phocis, but then inhabited by Thracians. It was, indeed, more probable that Pandion should form an alliance with a neighbouring chief, than that he should have sought a husband for his daughter at a great distance among the Odrysians." This remark equally applies to Orpheus and the other supposed Helleno-Thracian bards. It is more probable that the Greeks should have sought their early poets and musicians within the bosom of their own country, than among northern barbarians. The connexion, in this elegant fable[2], of the nightingale with the

[1] II. xxix.

[2] The version of it, however, here preferred by Thucydides is evidently of later Attic origin. In the legend of Homer, the name of the metamorphosed heroine's father is Pandareüs, Atticised in Thucydides into Pandion; that of her husband, Zethus. Odyss. τ. 518.

Hellenic Thrace, is in itself an obvious figure of an early preeminence of that region in poetry and song.

In this way may be elucidated various other Thracian chapters of Hellenic mythology. The worship of Bacchus, a Bœotian deity, is described as having met with great opposition in his native province. Among its fiercest opponents was Lycurgus, designated king of Thrace, but who is evidently, like Pentheus in the same series of fables, a type of the resistance offered by the Bœotian chiefs to the spread of those extravagant orgies. The "divine Nyseïan mountain" therefore, down which Homer[1] describes the God with his attendants as pursued by Lycurgus, and which the license of later mythology has transferred, not only to the barbarous Thrace, but to Syria, Arabia, India, and elsewhere[2], is to be sought at Nysa, a district of Mount Helicon, to which Homer applies the title of "preeminently divine,"[3] and where there was, in later times, a sanctuary of the God.[4] Pausanias[5], while expressing the same opinion as Thucydides regarding the Thrace over which Tereus held sway, also makes the "Thracian" bard Thamyris virtually a Phocian. He assigns him for mother a nymph of Parnassus called Argiope. His father Philammon is described as a native of the same region, son of Apollo by the

Nysa.

[1] Il. ζ. 133.

[2] Steph. Byz. and Hesych. in v. Νῦσα.

[3] Il. β. 508.

[4] Eustath. ad loc.; Soph. Antig. 1131.; Eurip. Bacch. 556.; Dicæarch. de Stat. Gr. v. 102.

[5] In the time of this author the name Thracis still attached to a community in Mount Helicon (x. iii.). A family of Thracidæ are also mentioned as office-bearers in the Delphic sanctuary. Diod. Sic. XVI. xxiv.

nymph Chione, and brother of Autolycus, its celebrated robber chieftain.[1] The divine grandsire is obviously here but a figure of his own sacred region; the grandmother Chione, as her name bears, of its snow. Others call the latter heroine Leuconoë.[2] The names of these heroines, Leuconoë, Argiope, Chionis, are all but so many varied modes of typifying the same "snow-white" Parnassus. This view of the "Thracian" character of these sages becomes the more plausible, if it be remembered that the region of Central Greece, in which the Hellenic Thrace was situated, is that from which, first or chiefly, the seeds of elementary culture were propagated throughout the nation. Here tradition places the first introduction of the alphabet. Here were also the principal seats of Apollo and the Muses. In the heart of the same region was situated the Minyean Orchomenus, the temple of the Graces, rivalling Thebes herself in the splendour of her princes and zeal for the promotion of art. Among the early masters of poetry or music, not vulgarly styled Thracians, the most illustrious, Amphion and Linus, are Bœotians. Nor was this region of Central Greece less favoured in respect of its religious institutions. It was not only the favourite seat of Apollo, the Muses, and the Graces, but the native country of the Dionysiac rites, zeal for the propa-

[1] Pausan. x. iv., iv. xxxiii.; conf. Apollod. Bib. i. iii.; Ovid. Metam. xi. 301. sqq.; Hygin. Fab. 200. The remaining particulars of the birth of Thamyris appear to be inventions of later fabulists, to account for the anomaly of a Phocian poet being also a Thracian. His mother Argiope, it is said, disowned and persecuted by her seducer, took refuge, when pregnant, among the Odrysians. "Hence," says Pausanias, "how Thamyris came to be called a Thracian."—iv. xxxiii.

[2] Hygin. Fab. 161.

gation of which is a characteristic of the Thracian sages.

While, therefore, the adoption of either a Pierian or a Phocian Thrace, as the birthplace of the earliest school of Greek poetry, obviates the difficulty of its barbaric origin, the hypothesis of some closer bond of connexion between the population of the two districts is also favoured by the fact of each containing one of the two most celebrated sanctuaries of the Muses, and by the correspondence in each between the names of several principal localities.[1]

Legendary minstrels.

3. In the list of fabulous Greek poets or musicians, the most illustrious names are those of Amphion, Orpheus, Philammon, Eumolpus, Musæus, Pamphos, Linus, Thamyris, Olen, Olympus. The biography of these mysterious personages belongs to the Greek mythology, rather than to the history of Grecian literature. A short notice will here suffice of the principal legends concerning them, and of their imputed

[1] Strabo, p. 410. 471.; conf. Thirl. Hist. of Gr. vol. I. p. 46.; Müll. Orch. 2d ed. p. 372.; Bode, Gesch. d. hell. Dichtk. vol. I. p. 111. The name Thrace is itself a significant term, indicating the geographical character of each district, a substantive form, namely, of the adjective Trachea (τραχεῖα), "rugged," by the customary enallage of the mute and aspirate letters. This epithet, in whichever of its varieties suited the local dialect, was precisely that by which a rocky wooded mountain district, bounded by a tract of fertile plain, would be designated, as contrasted with the vale or champaign country below. Thus the Parnassian, or Heliconian Thrace was the mountain region bounding the Bœotian plain; the Olympian, or Pierian Thrace was that to the north of the still wider plain of Thessaly, whence the name afterwards spread to the whole region lying north of Hellas; just as the term Asia spread from a single valley of Lydia to the whole great eastern continent, or that of Italia from a small corner of Magna Græcia to the entire Italian peninsula. Another mountain region on the southern frontier of Thessaly was named, with slight dialectical variety, Trachis; and various other districts, in different parts of Greece, received the same or similar appellatives from the same natural peculiarity.

influence on their favourite branches of composition.[1] To the first eight in the list a Hellenic, or, what is equivalent, a Thracian character belongs. The last two names, Olen of Lycia and Olympus of Phrygia, figure the influence of the neighbouring Asiatic school of music on that of Greece.

Amphion.

Amphion is described by Homer[2] as son of Jupiter, by Antiope, daughter of Asopus the chief river of Bœotia, and, with his brother Zetus, as founder and fortifier of Thebes the Bœotian metropolis. These notices entitle him to rank as the most antient Helleno-Pelasgian patriarch of that district. Cadmus consequently must be considered in Homer's legend, not as the founder, but as the later colonist of Thebes. The infancy and early youth of Amphion, owing to circumstances connected with the mystery of his birth, were passed in the obscurity of a shepherd's hut on mount Cithæron. Here he attracted the notice of Apollo, from whom, or in other accounts from Mercury or the Muses, he received the gift of a lyre, with so brilliant a faculty of using it, as to have collected the stones for the building of his city, and raised them to their places in the walls, by the fascination of his music.[3] This the interpreters of fable expound, aptly enough, as signifying that, by the persuasive eloquence of his muse, he induced his countrymen,

[1] Other less celebrated mythical poets of various epochs are: Bacis, whose oracular epigrams are frequently cited by Herodotus (VIII. XX. alibi); Chrysothemis of Crete; Mopsus, an Argonaut; and Phemonoë, the first Delphic priestess, reputed inventor of the hexameter verse (Paus. X. V.), and by some identified with the Cumæan Sibyl. The reader curious of more ample details relative to the whole of this class of fabulous characters, is referred to Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. I., to the articles in Smith's Dict. of Ant. Biogr., and other popular repertories.

[2] Odyss. λ. 260. sqq.; conf. Hor. de Art. poet. 394.

[3] Eumelus, Corinth. frg. XI.; Philostr. Im. I. X.

hitherto a scattered race of shepherds or husbandmen, to unite within the walls of a city for the better cultivation of the arts of civilised life. The punishment inflicted by Amphion and his brother Zetus on Dirce, a Bœotian princess, for the insult and persecution suffered by their mother Antiope at her hands, forms the subject of one of the most celebrated extant groups of antient sculpture.[1] But the divine favour vouchsafed Amphion in his earlier days deserted him in later life. He became the husband of Niobe, and father by her of that ill-fated offspring so celebrated in classic song. His death is attributed by some to the weapons of Apollo, as a punishment for the impious fury with which he gave vent to his indignation at the loss of his children; by others to his own suicidal act. He and his brother were buried in the same grave. The spot, though unadorned by any monument, was still revered as a sanctuary in the time of Pausanias; although the same author, on the authority of the antient poem of the Minyas, describes Amphion as tormented in Hades for the impieties of his latter days.[2]

4. The traditions concerning Orpheus, with a greater popularity in the later mythology, have less the character of genuine archaïc legend than those relative to Amphion and some other of his fellow-bards. It is remarkable, considering the lustre which has since attended this name, that no mention of it should occur in Homer, Hesiod, or other most antient poetical authorities.[3] Whilst Amphion represents the

Orpheus.

[1] Commonly called the Toro Farnese, or Farnesian Bull, preserved in the Royal Museum of Naples.

[2] Pausan. IX. v.: Minyas, frg. III.

[3] The first mention of him is by Ibycus, about 550 B.C. frg. 9.

popular genius of primeval poetry, Orpheus may be considered as the type of its religious or sacerdotal element. Accordingly, the mystical school of composition which sprang up towards the commencement of the Attic period of literature, simultaneously with a new and abstruse philosophy, connected itself inseparably with his name as its mythical founder. The works which passed vulgarly current in Plato's time as Hymns of the "Thracian" bard were probably some of the more esteemed productions of Onomacritus, Cercops, and other scholars of the time of the Pisistratidæ, celebrated for the concoction of such spurious compositions.[1] What may have been the primitive germ or spirit of the Orphic poetry, contemplated even in this light, it were fruitless to speculate, owing to the number and heterogeneous nature of the doctrines[2] embodied in the mass of mystical effusions afterwards comprised under the same title. The increasing celebrity of Orpheus, as inventor of the sacred or sacerdotal hymn, led to his becoming a sort of popular type of the lyric poetry at large of the mythical age. The legends concerning the marvellous influence of his art on gods, men, and animals, in the various adventures where, with even more than the usual contempt for consistency which characterises mythical chronology, he is made to figure, especially during the Argonautic expedition, surpass in number and extravagance those narrated of any other Greek minstrel.[3]

[1] Lobeck, Aglaoph. vol. i. p. 347.; Ritschl, Die Alex. Bibl. p. 42.

[2] See Lobeck, Aglaoph. p. 482. sq. alibi; Nitzsch, Myth. Wört. vol. ii. p. 375.

[3] For his reputed works, see Lobeck, Agl. p. 353. sqq.; Fabric. B. G. i. xviii. sq. Those which now pass under his name are: an epic

According to the general outline of these traditions, Orpheus was son of the muse Calliope and of Œagrus, a Thracian river god, or some other equally mysterious father, and disputes with Amphion the merit of first instructing his countrymen in the use of the lyre. That the Thracc possessing the most equitable claim to his nativity was the Pierian region, appears as well from the occurrence of a Pierus in the list of his ancestors[1], as from his Thracian tomb[2] (for various other countries claimed one) being shown within its bounds. His descent to Hades in search of his mistress Eurydice, where he lulled Cerberus to sleep, bewitched the inhabitants of the gloomy region, and softened the stern bosom of its sovereign by the melody of his notes, with the subsequent sad termination of his amorous adventures, forms an elegant and pathetic chapter in the book of classical fiction. The fury of the Thracian Mænads, to which he fell a sacrifice, is attributed in the more accredited legend[3] to his opposition to the Dionysiac mysteries, for which Pentheus, Lycurgus, and other heroes of the Hellenic Thrace were similarly punished. In other accounts he is represented as instrumental to the establishment of the same Bacchanalian ceremonies.[4] At his death his head and lyre, floating down the Hebrus, were conveyed beyond sea to the shore of Lesbos[5], where they were preserved and cherished as the

Argonautica, in 1384 lines; Lithica, or a Treatise on the Virtues of Stones, in 768 lines; with numerous hymns and other metrical fragments, mystical and philosophical.

[1] Lobeck, Aglaoph. p. 323.

[2] Paus. IX. XXX.

[3] Æschyl. ap. Eratosth. Catast. 24.

[4] Lobeck, Aglaoph. p. 295.

[5] Phanocl. frg. I.; cf. Lob. Aglaoph. p. 320. Other accounts (Conon, Narr. 45.; Ovid, Metam. XI. 50.) bore his head to Smyrna, the birthplace of Homer.

source of the brilliant flow of lyric composition for which that island was distinguished. This tradition is an evident figure of the passage of lyric genius, with the Æolian migration, from the western to the eastern shore of the Ægæan; and may also seem further to illustrate the connexion between the Pierian and the Bœotian Thrace, the latter being the mother country of those colonies.

Philammon. Philammon of Delphi was son of Apollo and the Parnassian nymph Chione, and father of the "Thracian" Thamyris. He was the reputed founder of the first musical solemnity at Delphi, and author of a hymn on the birth of Apollo, as also of various musical compositions. He was also distinguished as a warrior in defence of the Pythian sanctuary against an assault of the Phlegyans.[1]

Thamyris. Thamyris, his son by the nymph Argiope, and whose Parnasso-Thracian origin has already been illustrated, is chiefly celebrated for the adventure recorded of him by Homer.[2] Having challenged the Muses to a competition in his favourite art, and being defeated, he was punished for his presumption by the loss, not only of his poetical talent, but of his eyesight.

Eumolpus. 5. Eumolpus and Musæus, like Orpheus and Thamyris familiarly designated Thracians, act a prominent part in Athenian fable. The former, in the more popular accounts, was son of Neptune and the nymph Chione, already mentioned as mother of the Parnassian Philammon, but here described as an Attic, not a Parnassian heroine.[3] After various youth-

[1] Fabr. I. xxvi. [2] Il. β. 595., conf. Fabr. I. xxxv.
[3] Apollod. III. xv.; Pausan. I. xxxviii.

ful adventures, Eumolpus appears as a powerful "Thracian" sovereign, ally of Eleusis, then an independent state, in a war with Erechtheus king of Athens.[1] He is also made, in the sequel of this legend, founder of the Eleusinian mysteries, and ancestor of the sacerdotal family of Eumolpidæ, who, both in Athens and Eleusis, enjoyed the chief superintendance of the solemnity. This account, however, is by no means in harmony with that of the Homeric hymn to Ceres, a mythical authority of much prior age to those whence the above details are derived. In that poem Eumolpus is described as a patriarchal chief of Eleusis, who, with four other leaders of the local aristocracy, affords hospitality to the goddess in her wanderings, in gratitude for which she appoints their city the depositary of her sacred rites. Several works, in epic measure it would appear, passed current under his name, on subjects connected with the worship of both Ceres and Bacchus.[2]

Musæus is variously designated son of Orpheus, Linus, and Eumolpus.[3] Of the latter he is also occasionally made the father, while his only recorded mother is Selene, or the moon.[4] He usually ranks as a Thracian, sometimes however, from his fame and influence being chiefly connected with Attica, as an Athenian. His name, derived from that of the Muses, seems an obvious type of the early influence of those goddesses upon Athens. Visionary as his own person may be, the poems attributed to Musæus assume a definite reality at an earlier period than

Musæus.

[1] Isocrat. Panath. p. 273.; Thucyd. II. xv.; Pausan. sup. cit.
[2] Fabr. I. vi. 7.; conf. Diod. Sic. I. xi.
[3] Fabr. I. xvi.; Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 343.
[4] Plato, De Rep. p. 364.

those of any other author of the same class. From Herodotus[1] we learn that a collection of them, apparently of an oracular character, was extant in the time of the Pisistratidæ; and that Onomacritus, one of the literary clients of that family, was banished by Hipparchus for surreptitiously inserting among them compositions of his own. The spurious additions, however, seem to have enjoyed a greater popularity and permanence than the original works; for Pausanias[2] considered all the poems current in his time under the name of Musæus, with the exception of a single hymn to Ceres, as forgeries of Onomacritus. The most specific account of the religious creed of Musæus is a statement of Plato[3], that he made the happiness of the blessed in Elysium to consist in perpetual feasting and intoxication, a doctrine which certainly affords no very favourable impression of his system, either of morality or religion. His mythical dignity receives an important accession from the honours paid him by Virgil[4], who represents him in the Shades surrounded by a crowd of disciples, his authority over whom is figured by the superior height of his stature. This seems to imply that the Latin poet attributed a greater extent or reality to his influence, owing probably to his connexion with Athens, than to that of the other sages or civilisers of primitive Greece.

Pamphos.

Pamphos, of whose nativity no notice has been transmitted, is sometimes associated with Orpheus, sometimes with Musæus, in the exercise of his poeti-

[1] VII. vi.

[2] I. xxii. For the best list of his accredited poems, see Düntzer, Frg. Epicc. Græc. p. 72.

[3] Rep. p. 363.

[4] Æn. VI. 667.

cal functions, the chief scene of which, as in the case of the latter poet, was Attica. Hymns attributed to him, in honour of Jove, Ceres, Diana, Neptune, Cupid, and the Graces, were sung in the Eleusinian rites, in conjunction with those ascribed to Olen and Orpheus.[1]

Among these legendary minstrels, Linus is, perhaps, the one in whose favour even the popular accounts advance the slenderest claim to real personality, while the agency of which he is the symbol displays itself in the most palpable forms. In his symbolic capacity he appears as the Eponyme genius of plaintive music. His name, in the same symbolic sense, was common to a mournful song or ode performed in his honour, which will demand its due share of attention in a future chapter on the Orders of Greek lyric composition.[2] Any further details therefore, relative to himself or his art, will be reserved for that portion of our subject. Linus.

6. Olen and Olympus, the remaining minstrels on the list, are the only two, setting aside the letter of the Thracian legend, to whom tradition assigns a foreign origin. The former, who ranks as the earliest and most illustrious priest and poet of the Delian Apollo, is variously designated a Lycian and a Hyperborean. The Lycian version of his origin seems the more antient, being that adopted by the older authorities who notice him. In his sacerdotal character he may be claimed equally by both nations, as representing certain mysterious elements of Apollo's worship, connected on the one hand with the coast of Lycia, on the other with some undefined region of Olen.

[1] Pausan. I. xxxvii. alibi; Clint. F. Hell. vol. I. p. 344.

[2] Book III. Ch. ii. § 11.

Northern Europe.[1] The Lycian Olen was considered by Herodotus as author of the more antient hymns performed in the Delian festivals; and at Delphi the same honour was assigned him in his Hyperborean character.[2] Bœo, a celebrated priestess of that sanctuary, pronounces him, in two oracular lines, to be not only the most antient of Apollo's prophets, but of all poets, and inventor of the hexameter verse, the foundation of Hellenic poetry.[3] His hymns were also sung in the Eleusinian festival.[4] This reputed influence of the Lycian poet on the sacred music of Greece, is indirectly figured in other primitive traditions of a connexion between the two countries and their Apollo worship. In the Iliad Apollo appears as an essentially Lycian god, patron both of Lycia Proper and of another tribe of Lycians on the Hellespont. Among his Lycian attributes, one of the most prominent was that of "Lycean," or "Wolf-Apollo," embodying the more terrible features of his character. Under this title he was also worshipped in the Argolis[5]; and the coincidence stands in close connexion with other local legends, embodied by Homer in his episode of Prœtus and Bellerophon, concerning an intercourse between Lycia and the Argolis in mythical times. The remarkable monuments of primeval sculpture and architecture, still extant at Mycenæ in the latter region, and bearing obvious reference to the rites of Apollo[6], were

[1] Hdt. iv. xxxiii. sqq.; Paus. v. vii. 4.; conf. Müll. Dor. i. iv.; see also B. II. Ch. xxii. § 8. of this work; conf. B. III. Ch. v. § 3.

[2] Hdt. iv. xxxv. [3] Paus. x. v. [4] Paus. ix. xxvii.

[5] Müller, Dor. i. p. 215. sq. 302. sqq.

[6] See Journal of a Tour in Greece, vol. ii. p. 171. sq.; and p. 256., of an article in the Rheinische Museum, 1839, vol. vi.; both by the

also, in the popular tradition, ascribed to Lycian artists.[1]

The Asiatic origin of Olympus[2], or of the art he represents, is still more plainly indicated in the fables concerning him, than that of Olen in the Lycian legend. The chief or only musical instrument in early popular use in Greece, and at all times that most congenial to Hellenic taste, was the lyre, or harp. The flute enjoyed an equal preference among the nations of Asia Minor, from which country it was first brought into more general practice in Europe. The accredited author of its introduction was Olympus, who stands alone accordingly, among his Hellenic fellow-minstrels, in his preference of wind to string instruments. His birthplace is variously assigned to Phrygia, Mysia, and Lydia, but his reputed master in musical science, Marsyas the Phrygian, seems to connect him chiefly with the former region. The Greeks, however, distinguished two Olympi: the fabulous musician of the ante-Homeric period, and a real artist of the same name and country in later times, to whom, as will more fully appear hereafter[3], were ascribed many Olympus.

author of this work. He is now convinced, however, that the lost heads of the animals sculptured on the gate of Mycenæ were those of lions, not wolves, as he had once conjectured. He has been led to this conviction chiefly by the near resemblance of style which he has observed between the Lycian lions recently lodged in the British Museum and those of Mycenæ, especially by the extreme smallness of the head, which forms so marked a characteristic of the Lycian figures. This latter peculiarity, while proving that there would have been room for the heads of the Mycenæan lions, if of similar dimensions, in the space allotted them, supplies also an additional evidence of the connexion between the two schools of primitive art. Other still more pointed evidence of this connexion is traceable in the decorative architectural details of the monuments of each country; upon which, however, this is not the place to enlarge.

[1] Apollod. II. ii 1.; Strab. p. 373.; Paus. II. xxv.

[2] Clint. Fast. Hell. vol. I. § 344. [3] Infra, B. III. Ch. i. § 9.

of the more important inventions in the higher branches of music. The elder Olympus, therefore, may be considered but as a mythical reflexion of his real successor, called into existence to impart archaïc dignity to an art of comparatively recent cultivation in Greece.

Fabulous minstrelsy chiefly connected with the rites of Ceres or Bacchus.

7. It is remarkable that, while Apollo is at all periods of Greek tradition the patron deity of poetry and music, the legends of these primitive composers connect them chiefly with the worship of Ceres or with the kindred rites of Dionysus. This is the case with Orpheus, Musæus, Eumolpus, Pamphos, Thamyris, and probably Linus. In respect to Amphion and Olympus no special preference is recorded. Olen is the only one of higher celebrity who appears as an unqualified devotee of Apollo. The other legendary minstrels connected with the worship of that god, such as Philammon of Delphi and Chrysothemis of Crete, founders of the Pythian chorus, or Phemonoë the Pythoness, who disputed with Olen the invention of the hexameter verse, are of inferior and local fame. This peculiarity is explained by the circumstance, that the Dionysiac and Eleusinian rites were more immediately connected with those rural and agricultural festivities, which in all ages first acquire public importance and popularity.[1] It was natural therefore, that in the general tendency of Greek tradition to combine the early efforts of elegant art with religious ceremonial, the patron deities of those festivities should enjoy a priority, more especially in Central Greece, where religious poetry appears chiefly to have flourished. The whole of that region teems,

[1] For the worship of Apollo himself as a rural deity, see infra, B. II. Ch. xxii. § 7.

in the popular mythology, with the turbulent enthusiasm of the Bacchic and Eleusinian orgies, so favourable to the flights of lyric inspiration. The musical rites of Apollo seem, in Greece itself, to have been first indebted for their higher culture to his Dorian worshippers. The only spot where they appear with any degree of lustre in mythical times is Delos, where Olen asserts accordingly the honour of his patron deity.

Early ascendancy of Æolian genius.

Another inference suggested by this catalogue of primitive authors is the early ascendancy of Æolian genius in poetry and music. With the exception of the two foreigners, Olen and Olympus, they all, whether as Thracians in the sense above illustrated, or as Bœotians, belong to the Æolian family. Circumstances already noticed tended, it is true, in the course of national advancement, to obtain for the dialect of the Ionians a certain preference as the language of poetry; yet, as regards individual authors even in that dialect, it will be found that, while the influence of several of those fabulous Æolo-Thracian minstrels is described as chiefly exercised at Athens, a central seat of the purest Ionism, or in Peloponnesus[1], the later Æolians claim the honour of giving birth to both Homer and Hesiod, to the latter indisputably, to the former by a large preponderance of evidence. This priority, both as to invention and excellence, is maintained throughout the whole of the poetical period, in the more ideal branches of composition, musical and poetical, by Terpander, Arion, Alcæus, Sappho, and Stesichorus. In those branches which connect themselves more

[1] Il. β. 594.

nearly with the objects and interests of real life, the Elegy and Iambus for example, the more subtle and reflective Ionian genius, in the muse of Archilochus, Callinus, and Simonides, asserts its superiority.

Accredited works of this period.

Slender as may be the claims of these legendary bards to a substantial personality, they may at least be considered as representing the early improvers of Grecian poetry, who paved the way for the perfection in which it appears in the page of Homer. As their talents are reputed to have been so largely devoted to the service of the altar, it might seem natural, among a people so studious of antient religious observance, that some of their more esteemed compositions in honour of popular deities should, by the priesthood of the sanctuaries, have been secured a chance of permanent preservation. That works under the name of Musæus existed in the time of Pisistratus has already been stated. Herodotus also mentions hymns of Olen, and Plato[1] cites passages of Orpheus with apparent confidence. Aristotle[2] however, a higher authority in such matters, while recording his disbelief, not only of the genuine character of the poems attributed to Orpheus, but of their accredited author's existence, ascribes them to one Cercops, a Pythagorean philosopher, or to the same Onomacritus above noticed as the falsifier of Musæus. He quotes the poems of Musæus in one place without comment, in another as his reputed compositions.[3] Plato cites them frequently[4], and without qualification. As

[1] Phileb. p. 66. c.; Cratyl. p. 402. b.; conf. de Leg. p. 669.

[2] Ap. Cic. de Nat. Deor. i. xxxviii.; conf. Aristot. de An. i. v. 13.; Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. i. p. 332. sq.

[3] Polit. viii. v.; Hist. Anim. vi. vi.

[4] Apol. Soc. p. 41.; Ion, p. 536.; Rep. p. 364. b.; Protag. p. 316. d.

to the works now extant under any of the above titles, their own internal evidence has led modern scholars to a unanimous conviction of their comparatively recent origin. Even with the popular public in the best epochs of Greek literature, the names of these mythical poets were seldom seriously connected with poems of greater extent or variety of character than a few hymns, metrical oracles, and didactic pieces, moral or sacred. The longer, more elaborate compositions, such as the Argonautica and Lithica, vulgarly ascribed to Orpheus, seem first to have obtained their spurious honours at a very low period, for the history of which consequently, such critical notice as they demand will be reserved.

BOOK II.

POETICAL PERIOD.—EPIC POETRY.

CHAP. I.

INTRODUCTION.

1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POETICAL PERIOD. EPIC AND LYRIC STYLES ALONE CULTIVATED.—2. THEIR DEFINITION AND ORIGIN.—3. WORKS COMPRISED UNDER EACH HEAD.—4. PROPOSED MODE OF TREATMENT.

Characteristics of the poetical period.

1. The period treated in the following book extends from Homer, or the origin of the Homeric poems, down to the LVth Olympiad (560 B.C.), the epoch at which Pisistratus usurped supreme power at Athens. It has been styled poetical, because the works it produced, in so far as known to fame, belong exclusively to that style of composition. It might also not improperly, in contradistinction to the purely mythical era, be entitled historical, as treating of living works, and authors advancing a solid claim to real personality.

Although prose writing must have been more or less generally practised, during this period, for purposes of utility or necessity, the notices of any attempts towards its cultivation as a branch of popular literature are obscure and doubtful. Its origin will, therefore, form more appropriate matter of investigation at the future stage of this history where it asserts an equality with the sister Muse, or even an ultimate ascendancy, in popularity and influence.

Epic and lyric styles alone cultivated.

The whole poetical literature of Greece was familiarly classed by the native critics under three comprehensive heads: Epic, Lyric, and Dramatic. The compositions of this period fall to be considered under the two former alone; the Drama, like prose writing, being yet so completely in its infancy as not to supply material for a separate subdivision.

Their definition and origin.

2. The term Epic, in its literal acceptation, denotes what is narrated or recited; Lyric, what is sung to the lyre. This, however, like some other similar distinctions invented at a later stage of the arts to which they apply, will be found defective in regard to the origin or more flourishing epochs of those arts. Epic poems were, during the earlier and better days of Greek heroic minstrelsy, chanted to an instrumental accompaniment little less habitually than lyric odes. The latter epithet might therefore, in so far, appear as applicable to the Iliad and Odyssey as to a song of Sappho or an elegy of Mimnermus. The distinction is, however, justified even in its extension to this early period, by the more artificial nature of the accompaniment, and the more vital connexion between the music and the words, in the one than the other case. This may be illustrated by the analogy of the Italian opera, where the recitative, with its few harmonious chords struck at appropriate intervals, stands to the aria in a relation similar to that of the epic to the lyric department of Greek poetry.[1] The nicer distinction of terms may have originated about the period

[1] The illustration will be the more apparent to those familiar with the recitative of the professional improvvisatori. Müller's limitation of this accompaniment to a few notes of simple prelude, to regulate the pitch of the voice, the whole remainder of the performance being purely vocal, is as improbable in itself, as unwarranted by his overstrained interpretation of the phrase ἀναβάλλομαι in the poet's text. Hist. Gr. Lit. p. 33.

when lyric composition first acquired importance as a branch of cultivated literature ; epic poetry being then on the decline, and the practice of its musical recital gradually falling into disuse.[1]

The origin of both styles is lost in the mists of antiquity. The earliest efforts in each are probably simultaneous, in every imaginative people, with the first steps in civilisation. The rudest attempt to embody in an attractive form the narrative of an interesting event was an epic poem. The first simple effusion of praise or gratitude to a god or hero was a lyric ode. That both branches were popular in the age of Homer appears from the indirect evidence of his works. To the lyric order belong, in the Iliad, the Pæan, the Dirge or Funeral Lament, and the Hymenæal Chorus[2]; in the Odyssey, the songs with which Calypso and Circe enliven the labours of their loom.[3] Lyric was also the music of the vintage feast, and that which accompanies the dance of Dædalus on the shield of Achilles.[4] Of the Pæan two varieties may be distinguished. The sacrifical or convivial Pæan[5], performed at the banquet in honour of the restoration of Chryseïs to her father, appears to have been sung in parts by a chorus of youths, divided into companies and responding to each other. The triumphal or processional Pæan[6] is sung by the Greek warriors, on their march back to the camp bearing the corpse

[1] A parallel distinction is observable in the use of the terms ἀοιδή and ἔπη. With Homer, ἀοιδή denotes all poetry or song, whether epic or lyric ; ἔπη, merely conversation or discourse. In later times, ἔπη is the familiar phrase for every kind of recitative or epic poetry ; ἀοιδή, or ᾠδή, is limited to song in the stricter sense, or lyric performance. The longer, more continuous epic narrative, or epopee, bears with Homer the title οἶμη.

[2] σ. 493. [3] ε. 61., κ. 220. [4] σ. 569. 590. [5] a. 472. [6] χ. 391.

of Hector. In the Dirge over the body of Hector[1] in the Trojan palace, professional bards officiate as a chorus to the chief mourners, who successively relieve each other in their melancholy functions.

As Epic, on the other hand, may be classed, in the Iliad the celebration by Achilles of the "glorious deeds of men;"[2] in the Odyssey the narratives of the exploits of Ulysses and other heroes of the Trojan war by the court bards of Scheria and Ithaca. The description of the sack of Troy by Demodocus, as epitomised by Homer[3], offers many essential features of a finished epopee.

But although in point of origin these two branches of composition may be classed as coeval, the Epic invariably enjoys a priority of cultivation, wherever the progress of letters, as in Greece, is spontaneous and free from secondary influence. This is a consequence of the more direct medium through which it appeals to the sympathies, as will be made apparent by a somewhat closer definition of the respective properties of the two.

Epic poetry may be defined as essentially historical or descriptive; Lyric poetry as speculative or discursive: the former deals with facts and events, the latter with feelings and opinions.

The mass of mankind however, in all ages, are more interested in the study of facts than of opinions, in listening to accounts of great or marvellous adventures, than to commentaries on the admiration of which they may be deserving. What is here true of the less educated class in every age, applies to the public at large in a primitive state of society. But,

[1] ω. 720. [2] α. 189. [3] θ. 500.

besides the pleasure of reciting or hearing, the anxiety to perpetuate constituted another powerful cause of this preference. Epic poetry, apart from its pleasantness, possessed, as the popular chronicle of events, a superior utility to the sister branch of art; and that utility was inseparable from its permanence. There was no similar inducement to preserve an outbreak of enthusiastic emotion relative to a particular person or transaction. Novelty was perhaps, in such cases, more desirable than repetition. The superior credit enjoyed by the Epic Muse with the primitive public is evinced, accordingly, by the fact of her compositions having been preserved, in considerable mass, from a period of antiquity several centuries prior to that of the earliest extant specimens of pure lyric art.

The difference of the mode in which the two styles are embodied corresponds to that of their characters. In the epic an exclusive preference is given to prolonged metrical forms in harmony with the continuity of the narrative. The lyric offers a greater subdivision, and more varied combination of numbers, adapted to its more lively and versatile expression of thought or feeling.

Works comprised under each head.

3. Under these two general heads of Epic and Lyric have here been comprised various works but partially marked by the proper features on which the distinction above drawn depends, and which might therefore appear, in a more accurate classification, to require a separate allotment. To the Epic head, for example, have been referred the Works and Days of Hesiod, and the Homeric Hymns. The former poem, in a more artificial age of literature, would be assigned to the Didactic rather than the Epic style.

At the period, however, in which this distinction of terms takes its origin, and indeed, more or less, throughout the flourishing ages of Grecian art, the phrase Epic familiarly denotes any descriptive or narrative work, anything told or recited, as distinct from sung or dramatically represented. All poems of the former class were embodied, accordingly, by preference in hexameter verse, as the standard epic rhythm, the employment of which hence became, in its turn, the popular criterion of the epic style of a work. As referred to this test, consequently, the "Works and Days" was an epic poem. The Homeric Hymns, on the other hand, might seem, both in right of their title and their subject, to belong to the Lyric order. The epic character however, in the narrower sense, really predominates in these poems to such an extent as, apart from any technical law of criticism, to warrant the arrangement here adopted. Besides the Hymns, certain other minor hexameter compositions, usually classed, with the Hymns, under the title Homeric, and not devoid of pretensions to respectable antiquity, have, although partaking in no similar degree of the narrative style, been comprehended under the same general denomination of epic poetry.

From deference to a parallel law of custom, various works have been embraced in the Lyric head of subject, which, on a more subtle principle of distinction, might appear to belong more properly to the epic. The Elegiac measure for example, though in its origin and early use familiarly ranked as lyric, was frequently employed in narrative or didactic poems of considerable compass. It may indeed be considered as an intermediate stage between the one

style and the other, being compounded of purely dactylic elements, with such modification as was requisite to adapt the old heroic hexameter to compositions of a more fugitive nature. The Iambic trimeter on the other hand, appropriated, during its earlier stages of cultivation, to the same class of poem as the elegy, and like it comprehended under the general head of lyric poetry, possesses epic qualities only inferior to the hexameter. These qualities, combined with a certain rhetorical spirit and smartness peculiar to itself, obtained for it at a later period a preference in dramatic poetry, similar to that enjoyed by the hexameter in the primitive epic minstrelsy.

Upon the above general data therefore, the whole Greek literature of this period may be classed as follows:—

I. Epic composition, comprising, in addition to heroic poems properly so called, every work in hexameter verse possessing reasonable claims to date prior to the LVth Olympiad.

II. Lyric composition, comprising every poetical work not embodied in hexameter verse, and by consequence, the whole elegiac and iambic, in addition to the melic and choral poetry of the period.

Proposed mode of treatment.

4. Each class will be made the subject of a separate treatment. This mode has here been considered preferable to that of interlacing the contemporary history of different branches, which is sometimes followed in more advanced stages of literature. The connexion between the two, or influence of one upon the other, is indeed comparatively slight. In the earliest times epic poetry was alone cultivated. It had reached its perfection, and was falling into decay, prior to the

age from which the oldest specimens of lyric composition have been transmitted. As a general rule each style had its own distinct set of authors, who rarely, if ever, trenched on the province of each other. The maturity and lustre of the elder more dignified Muse had but little effect in promoting, more perhaps in retarding, the progress of her more youthful and sprightly sister. Still less influence had the youth and vigour of the latter in sustaining the old age and decrepitude of her predecessor. The vicissitudes of each were chiefly owing to causes connected with the general progress of society, to be duly considered in their proper place.

CHAP. II.

HOMER. ILIAD AND ODYSSEY. HISTORY OF THE POEMS.

1. HOMER, HESIOD, AND THE CYCLIC POETS. — 2. ORIGIN AND DEFINITION OF THE HOMERIC EPOPEE. — 3. EARLIEST NOTICES OF THE ILIAD AND ODYSSEY: HESIOD, CHEST OF CYPSELUS. ARCHILOCHUS, TYRTÆUS, HOMERIDÆ, XENOPHANES. — 4. PUBLIC RECITAL, OR RHAPSODISM. — 5. EARLY VARIATIONS OR CORRUPTIONS OF THE TEXT. EFFORTS TO CORRECT THEM. "CIVIC EDITIONS." ANTIMACHUS, ARISTOTLE. — 6. ALEXANDRIAN GRAMMARIANS AND THEIR EDITIONS. — 7. "CHORIZONTES," OR SEPARATISTS. CRATES. SCHOOL OF PERGAMUS. DIVISION OF THE TEXT INTO BOOKS. LATER GRAMMARIANS. — 8. MODERN HISTORY OF THE POEMS. VICO. WOLF. — 9. SUBSEQUENT VICISSITUDES OF THE HOMERIC QUESTION.

Homer, Hesiod, and the Cyclic poets.

1. THE oldest monuments of Hellenic minstrelsy extant in historical times were two voluminous bodies of epic poems. The one comprised works in the nobler heroic style, recording great events or enterprises, and characterised by extent of subject and unity of treatment; the other was limited to compositions of narrower scope or inferior order, genealogies of men and gods, narratives of the exploits or adventures of individual heroes, and illustrations, didactic and descriptive, of the affairs of ordinary life. The works of the former class, amid the obscure origin of the greater part of them, passed generally current, together with some minor poems marked by a certain resemblance of manner, under the name of "Homer." Those of the second class, for similar reasons, were in the same general way ascribed to "Hesiod." The remaining epic productions of this period, not properly falling within either denomination, may be comprehended under a third head, of Mis-

cellaneous epic poetry. The claims of the two latter classes, either in respect of their own merits or their influence on Greek literature, are of secondary importance, and must for the present be postponed; those of the former class demand an immediate and extensive share of attention.

At the remotest epoch to which the notices of their existence extend, not only the Iliad and Odyssey, but a large portion of the remaining more elaborate specimens of primitive epic art, were, as already stated, popularly ascribed to "Homer." In the progress, however, of critical inquiry, those two poems obtained, at first in the opinion of more competent judges, afterwards with the Hellenic public at large, an exclusive title to that distinction. The remainder were connected with the names of other early poets, or were classed as anonymous. Their claims to celebrity appear, indeed, to rest as much on the nature of their connexion with their great prototypes, as on their own intrinsic value. If we may judge from the somewhat slender data at our disposal, comparative mediocrity would seem to have been the characteristic of the greater part of them. Neither the whole, nor an integral portion of any one of them, has been preserved, and the passages cited by extant Greek authors from their text are unfortunately but rare and scanty. Their titles, however, with the historical notices of their contents, amounting in various instances to a detailed epitome of their action, show them to have been composed with the view of enlarging and completing the series of legendary annals of which the Iliad and Odyssey had already engrossed two important stages. The Thebaïd, Epigoni, and Cypria brought down the history

of the Achæan race of warriors, from the epoch at which it first took the lead in the Grecian confederacy, to the opening of the Iliad. The Æthiopis, Lesser Iliad, Ilii Persis, and Nosti, filled up the space between the conclusion of the Iliad and the commencement of the Odyssey. That portion of the whole series of events which the original Homer had treated, was studiously avoided by the authors of these supplementary works. They were not, however, equally respectful towards each other, nor were the limits of their several subjects so accurately marked out as to exclude, in occasional instances, a treatment of the same event in different poems. This whole chain of epic narrative constituted what is called, in later times, the Epic or Homeric Cycle; under which name it is understood to have been indebted for a more methodical redaction to the Alexandrian grammarians. These compilers are supposed, by selecting such among the duplicate chapters as appeared, either in point of merit or continuity of subject, to deserve a preference, and discarding the rest, to have imparted a more complete continuity to the series; which, when so arranged, extended from the origin of things to the generation immediately prior to the Dorian irruption. That event, as formerly remarked, was tacitly adopted, by the courtesy of Greek literature, as the limit between the heroic and historical age.

Assuming as a basis the unanimous judgment of the best native critics, who set apart the Iliad and Odyssey as the only genuine productions of the great original master, around which the remainder were clustered like satellites round two brilliant stars, we shall now enter upon the separate inquiry into their origin and history.

Origin and definition of the Homeric epopee.

2. Epic poetry, as the reflexion of that twofold instinct of our nature, to perpetuate, and at the same time adorn, the memory of great men or remarkable events, comprehends every species of metrical narrative, from the simplest ballad to the Iliad. The epic poem however in the nobler sense, or Epopee, as it is technically called, represents a more advanced stage of the art. It may be considered as the combination of a number of those insulated subjects into one comprehensive whole.[1] The poet of the one class may be likened to the mason skilled in constructing a wall, chiseling a column, or throwing an arch; of the other, to the architect of a spacious building. Although therefore the Iliad and Odyssey are held, and probably with reason, to be, in their individual capacity, more antient than the oldest poems ascribed to Hesiod, they represent an order of work of more recent origin. How far their accredited author, even admitting their still disputed claim to original integrity, is entitled to the sole honour of so noble an invention, may be questioned. No art arrives at perfection by a single effort; and there is more truth in the remark of Cicero, that as there were men of valour before Agamemnon, there must have been poems of considerable bulk before the Iliad, than in the more familiar adage of Horace to the opposite effect. That such earlier poems have not been preserved is no argument that none ever existed, or even that they were not worth preserving.

[1] In this distinction various critics, antient and modern, would discover a figurative etymology for the name Ὅμηρος, deriving it from ὁμοῦ and ἁρω, to combine or connect, as indicating the first accredited author of any such comprehensive epic production. Eustath. ad Il. Proœm. p. 4.; conf. Welck. Ep. Cycl. p. 125. sq.; Bode, Gesch. d. Hell. Dichtk. vol. I. p. 259.

If the Demodoci whom Homer celebrates be not real personages, they represent at least a class more antient than the poet who describes them; and one of them is introduced as author or reciter of a comprehensive and complicated epic poem. The natural effect of the appearance of two such works as the Iliad and Odyssey in a primitive age, when the art of writing was unknown or little practised, would be to supplant, and probably extinguish, those previously current. There was here no remedy for any temporary neglect on the part of the public, and poems once erased from the tablets of the memory were lost for ever.

Of the origin or author of either work, the only authentic source of knowledge is their own text. It seems difficult to understand how, among a people so proverbially studious of the memory of the past, all accurate record of the source to which they were indebted, not only for their most popular work of genius, but for their most esteemed text-book of early history and religious doctrine, should, in the course of a few generations, have become extinct. This appears the more surprising, when we consider that, from the earliest period at which notice occurs of the poems, the veneration in which they are held is accompanied by an equal spirit of curiosity relative to their author. Hence, while their study was the basis of the more elegant branches of literary criticism, the efforts to penetrate the mystery of their origin became the foundation of the historical department of the same art. During five and twenty hundred years this inquiry has occupied the subtlest investigators of every age. On no other similar subject have more strange or conflicting theories been pro-

posed, more voluminous commentaries expended, or a keener spirit of controversy displayed; on none, perhaps, has the lavish exuberance of speculative inquiry been more barren hitherto of positive results.

The usual custom of literary criticism enjoins that the article devoted to each author should commence with some notice of his age, birthplace, and character. The peculiarities of the present subject render it necessary, it need hardly be said, to reverse this order. Homer exists but in his poems. They supply the only authentic materials for his biography. The history of the work must here, therefore, necessarily precede that of the author.

Earliest notices of the poems Hesiod.

3. The earliest extant allusions to the Iliad and Odyssey are chiefly of an indirect nature, citations namely, or paraphrases, of portions of their text, by poets of more recent date but also of high antiquity. The "Shield of Hercules," ascribed to Hesiod, is borrowed, and in many parts servilely copied, from the episode of the "Arms of Achilles" in the 18th book of the Iliad. On the Chest of Cypselus at Olympia, executed probably not later than the eighth century B.C., were sculptured in relief, and illustrated by brief poetical inscriptions, various adventures of each poem, with so close a correspondence in the particulars as to prove the artist's familiarity with their text.[1] The engagement between Agamemnon and the Antenoridæ was represented precisely as in the 11th book of the Iliad[2]; and the shield of the Greek commander was inscribed with a verse bearing pointed reference to Homer's description of it in a previous passage of the same book. The subject of

Chest of Cypselus.

[1] Pausan. v. xix.

[2] 248. sq.

another compartment was the scene of the Odyssey[1] where Ulysses and Circe retire to rest. The four waiting-maids of the goddess are mentioned in the lines annexed, as engaged in the same functions assigned them by Homer. The delivery of the arms by Vulcan to Thetis[2], and the drive of Nausica from her father's palace to the shore[3], were portrayed with equal fidelity to the Homeric original. The interview between Menelaus and Proteus in the 4th, and the Dance of the Phæacians in the 8th book of the Odyssey, were represented in the sculptures of the Throne of Apollo at Amyclæ, executed in the early part of the sixth century B.C.[4]

Archilochus. Tyrtæus.

The poems of Archilochus and Tyrtæus offer similar traces of familiarity with those of Homer. Allusion also occurs, at an early period, to a race or society of Homeridæ at Chios, who claimed descent from the poet, and hereditary privileges in connexion with his works.[5]

Homeridæ.

Xenophanes.

The first actual mention of the name Homer occurs in a verse of Xenophanes of Colophon[6], who lived towards the close of this period, and describes the poems as in his day the standard manual of elementary instruction. Even at this early epoch they seem to have furnished material for critical redaction and commentary. Xenophanes himself treated in several of his works of the comparative age and merits of Homer and Hesiod.[7] The labours of Pisistratus of Athens and his coadjutors, to which so much importance has been attached in the modern schools, will be more fully considered in

[1] κ. 348. sqq. [2] Il. σ. [3] Od. ζ. [4] Paus. III. xviii.

[5] Acusilaus et Hellanicus ap. Harpocr. v. Ὁμηρίδαι; conf. Philostr. ap. Schol. Pind. Nem. II. 1.; Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 160.

[6] Ap. Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 186. [7] Karsten, Fragm. VII. xxxi.

the sequel. Contemporary with these Attic scholars was Theagenes of Rhegium, whose commentaries on the poems and their author were esteemed by later critics, and whose various readings, or those of the edition he followed, are cited by the Venetian scholiast.[1] From this epoch downwards the notices of Homer and his works are of constant occurrence. It does not, however, always plainly appear how far the title "Homer" is limited, in the citations of this period, to the Iliad and Odyssey, how far it may not extend to the other Homeric works above described. Callinus[2], the very antient elegaic poet, (B.C. 700), is said to have attributed the Cyclic Thebaïs, Pindar[3] the Cypria, to "Homer;" and a similar practice, extending to other poems of the Cycle, prevailed at a much later period in popular quarters. Herodotus, the first extant author who uses the terms Iliad and Odyssey, is also the first who distinctly sets apart those two poems as genuine works of Homer, and discards the claim of others, especially the Cypria and Epigoni, to any such honour.[4]

Public recital, or rhapsodism.

4. The public recital of the poems appears to have prevailed throughout Greece from a remote period. The place with which tradition first connects it is Chios, an island advancing special claims to be considered the birthplace of Homer, which claims were supported by zeal in preserving and cultivating his works. At Sicyon, as Herodotus[5] informs us, the practice was abolished by the tyrant Clisthenes (about 600 B.C.),

[1] Villoison, Præf. ad Scholl. Venet. p. xxv.; Nitzsch, Hist. Hom. pt. i. p. 131.

[2] Ap. Pausan. ix. ix.; conf. Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 298.

[3] Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 300. [4] ii. cxv. sq., iv. xxxii. [5] v. lxvii.

from jealousy of the superior glory reflected by the poems on the neighbouring rival state of Argos. The first public honours awarded them in Sparta are dated by the best authorites from the age of Lycurgus, by whom they were established in that republic, as a national text-book of martial instruction.[1] In Athens, their public rehearsal is alluded to generally by Isocrates[2] and others, as of remote antiquity, and was indebted to Solon for improved regulations in the mode of performance.[3] Its introduction into Syracuse is attributed to Cynæthus[4], a Chian Homerid of the age of Pindar. The origin and primary import of the title Rhapsodist, familiarly borne by the performers in these solemnities, is obscure. The generally received etymology is that which characterises them as Stitchers or Botchers of poems. The allusion here is partly to the irregularities of which they were guilty, by disturbing the proper order of the text in their recital; partly to their imputed interpolation of matter from their own stores; partly, perhaps chiefly, to their habit of prefixing or subjoining to the original poems, or parts of poems, dedicatory prologues or epilogues in honour of the deities with whose festivals such public performances were connected. Others[5] derived the name from the staff, or wand of office (rhabdos, rhapis), which distinguished the profes-

[1] Aristot. ap. Heraclid. de Laced. Rep. II.; conf. Schneidewin, ad loc. et in præf. ad frgg.; Plut. vit. Lyc. c. 4.

[2] Paneg. c. 42.

[3] Diog. Laert. in Vit. ix.

[4] Philostr. ap. Schol. Pind. Nem. II. 1.; conf. Eustath. Procem. ad Il. p. 6.

[5] Welcker, Ep. Cyc. p. 358. sq. Pindar appears to countenance both etymologies; Isth. IV. 66., Nem. II. init. The latter passage also indirectly alludes to the rhapsodist custom, adverted to in the text, of stitching on procemia.

sional reciter of later times from the original poet. While the latter sang, solely or chiefly, his own compositions to the accompaniment of his lyre, the rhapsodist, bearing a laurel branch or wand as his badge of office, rehearsed, without musical accompaniment, the poems of others. The former interpretation is the more plausible; for whatever degree of value may have attached to the services of this fraternity, a certain degree of sarcasm seems, at every period, to have been connected with their name. From it derives that of Rhapsody, originally applied to the portions of the poems habitually allotted to different performers in the order of recital, afterwards transferred to the twenty-four books, or cantos, into which each work was permanently divided by the Alexandrian grammarians.

Early variations, or corruptions of the text.

5. It seems doubtful how far this widely extended popularity may have contributed to maintain the purity of the text. The Iliad and Odyssey were the acknowledged standard or digest, as it were, of early national history, geography, and mythology. It came, therefore, to be considered essential to the dignity of each tribe or race, in later times, that honourable mention should be made in those poems of their cities or heroes; and such as were overlooked endeavoured to save their credit by the surreptitious insertion of passages creditable to themselves, or by condemning as spurious those which conferred honour on a rival. The professional officiousness of the rhapsodists also led them, in the mode already noticed, to tamper with the text, although more importance, probably, has been attached to this source of corruption than it deserves. The existing notices of these practices refer chiefly to the commencement of the

sixth century B. C., when the closer connexion between the different Hellenic states, the consequent increase of international rivalry, and rapid extension of literary taste and resources, afforded new temptations, with new facilities, for such license. The results appear, not only in the number of various readings preserved by commentators, but in the citation, by respectable authorities, of passages of Homer now no longer to be found in his text.[1] Some of these quotations have been referred, with apparent reason, to those other antient poems which still continued, in popular usage, to be classed under the head of Homer or Homeric. But, even with this allowance, there would remain a certain number for the Iliad and Odyssey.

Perhaps, however, these varieties are not exclusively owing to the license of editors or rhapsodists. Another and a purer source, hitherto unnoticed by critics, might be a corresponding variety in the genius of the original author. Without here entering on the much agitated question, how far the early transmission of the poems may be due to the art of memory, how far to that of writing, it may at least be admitted that the chief means of their general promulgation was by open recital. Whatever may have been the case with a few curious repositories of the text, the public at large was a listening rather than a reading public. But, even in our own age, the author of a popular work, after its first publication, usually finds cause for alteration or correction, and avails himself of a new edition for that purpose. It may however safely be assumed, both that such

[1] Düntzer, Fragm. der Ep. Poes. pt. I. p. 27. sqq.

variations would occur in equal or greater numbers to a poet of Homer's age and character, and that he would be still more ready to give effect to them. Even without any change in the substance of his narrative, he would naturally be disposed to diversify the details of illustration or description to suit the taste of different audiences; and such variations, transferred to the memory or the written copies of different portions of the public, would give rise to controversy, which was the original, which the interpolated text.[1]

Entire copies of works of so great compass would also, during the earlier period of their circulation, amid the imperfection of the mechanical element of literature, be comparatively rare. Each rhapsodist however, would be desirous to possess in manuscript, those portions at least in the recital of which he chiefly excelled. This would lead to the circulation of garbled or imperfect editions. Such piecemeal transmission, both in rehearsal and writing, is accordingly mentioned, by the earliest critical authorities on the subject, as one chief cause of confusion or corruption.

Efforts to correct them. "Civic editions."

But to whatever sources those floating varieties may be traceable, it became, with the advance of literary culture, the more desirable to check the license in which they originated. This object could only be effectually attained by establishing, with the common sanction of the nation, in so far as it could be procured, a standard text of the national poet.

[1] See a remarkable passage of Goethe (Briefwechsel zw. Schiller und G. vol. III. p. 71.), where he draws a parallel between various texts of Homer stigmatised by Wolf as recent interpolations, and passages of his own poems added by himself on subsequent revisal, for the purpose of eluoidating his subject or improving his style.

And here the practice of rhapsodism, if on the one hand it may have been a source of corruption, was instrumental in providing a remedy, by suggesting to the different states where it prevailed the compilation, under public auspices, of complete editions for the use of the festivals. Many such accordingly were extant in later times, under the title of Civic, or State editions. For this service the Athenian public was indebted to the joint labours of Solon and Pisistratus. Solon is described as having checked the prevailing irregularities of recital, and forced the rhapsodists to adhere to the regular order of the text[1]; Pisistratus as having collected or compiled the poems, previously in a state of disorder, into a single body or volume.[2] The earliest edition however, of which mention occurs in later times coupled with the name of an individual redactor, is that of Antimachus of Colophon[3], a contemporary of Plato, and himself a poet of some celebrity. Aristotle[4], besides a tract entitled "Homeric Difficulties," no longer extant, and the commentaries interspersed in his miscellaneous works, also prepared an edition of the Iliad for the use of his illustrious pupil Alexander, who carried it, inseparable from his person, in a precious casket; hence its familiar name, the Edition of the Casket. The proper execution however of this task, was beyond the resources of any single editor, however great his personal qualifications. It required a succession of efforts, under a combination of favourable circumstances, such as did not take

Antimachus. Aristotle.

[1] Dieuchidas ap. Diog. Laert. in Sol. ix.: *οἷον ὅπου ὁ πρῶτος ἔληξεν, ἐκεῖθεν ἄρχεσθαι τὸν ἐχόμενον*; conf. Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 378. sqq.

[2] See infra, Ch. iii. § 1.

[3] Wolf, Proleg. p. 174. 182.

[4] Wolf, ibid. p. 183. sq.

place for several generations subsequent to the age of Aristotle.

Alexandrian grammarians, and their editions.

6. The decline of original genius in Greece was simultaneous with that of freedom and political virtue. From the epoch of the Macedonian supremacy the national talent, deprived of that creative power by which it had hitherto been animated, was directed to the imitation of the more perfect antient models, and, by consequence, to a studious analysis of the principles on which their excellence depended. The arts of grammar and criticism, which had hitherto formed no separate branch of literary pursuit, now became one of the most popular, and the poems of Homer the favourite subject for its exercise. Alexandria, under the auspices of her munificent sovereigns, took the lead in this, as in every other walk of literature: and to the labours of her succession of able masters, we are mainly indebted for the purity and integrity in which the standard monuments of Greek poetical genius have been transmitted to posterity. The zeal of the Ptolemies for the encouragement of learning placed at the disposal of its professors all the aids which wealth and power, often arbitrarily exercised, could supply. Neither pains nor cost were spared in collecting the more antient and authoritative copies of Homer from every part of the Hellenic world, while the vast library amassed at Alexandria afforded all the incidental resources for the prosecution of such studies. Among the older texts collated by the Alexandrian editors, the Massilian, Chian, Argive, Cyprian, Sinopic, Cretan[1], and Æolic[2], called col-

[1] Wolf, Prol. p. 175.

[2] Buttm. Schol. ad Odyss. p. 607.

lectively the "Civic" or "State editions," to distinguish them from those by "individual editors[1]," seem to have stood in the highest estimation. No distinct notices have been preserved of their relative antiquity, or the special ground of their reputation. The Massilian and Chian appear to have been considered of best authority. The Chian was doubtless that authorised in the old Homeric school of recitation established in the city from which its name is derived. The Massilian was also probably of Ionian origin, transported from Asia by the Phocæans into their Gallic colony, either on its first foundation in 600 B.C., or by the refugees from the parent city, when destroyed by the Persians sixty years afterwards. The others may also be presumed to have been similarly compiled under national auspices.

The more detailed account of the lives or labours of the Alexandrian grammarians belongs to another portion of this history. A succinct notice of their services in regard to Homer will here suffice. It must be borne in mind that their entire compositions are now lost, but the copious notices of their views, contained in the extant scholia, afford sufficient data for estimating both the real and comparative value of their treatment of the poems.

The most distinguished names are those of Zenodotus, Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and Crates. The claims of Zenodotus[2] to celebrity consist chiefly in his having been the founder of a school, and prepared the way for better things. He also enjoys the credit of having compiled and arranged the collective works

[1] *αἱ πολιτικαί, κατὰ πόλεις, ἐκ πόλεων*; and *αἱ κατ' ἄνδρα.* Villois. Proleg. ad Sch. Ven. p. 26.

[2] B.C. 320—245. Ritschl, Die Alexand. Bibl. p. 89.

of the national epic poets.[1] His commentaries on Homer display little either of correct judgment or insight into the genius of his author, and his treatment of the text of the poems was proverbially arbitrary and licentious. Nearly contemporary with Zenodotus, the poets Aratus[2] and Rhianus[3] undertook editions of Homer. That of Rhianus remained in good credit in the subsequent schools. The labours of Aratus seem to have been confined to the Odyssey, and, if completed, obtained but little authority, no appeal being made to his readings in the extant scholia. The answer of Timon the Phliasian, to the question proposed to him by Aratus as to the best mode of reestablishing the genuine text, sheds light on the state of Homeric criticism at this period. His advice was, to procure and collate antient copies without regard to those then in circulation.[4] This want was supplied for behoof of Zenodotus by his patron Ptolemy Philadelphus, to whom the Alexandrian library was chiefly indebted for its rich store of standard codices of Homer, as of other leading Greek poets. Zenodotus was succeeded, as head of the Alexandrian school, by his pupil Aristophanes[5] of Byzantium, a scholar of better judgement and more accurate learning. He was the first who started doubts of the genuine character of the latter part of the Odyssey, placing the termination of the poem at the 296th verse of the 23rd book.[6] This view was also favoured by his successor Aristarchus[7], the critic of highest fame and authority among the antients. To him the public were indebted for what

[1] See Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 8. 12.
[2] Wolf, Prol. p. 186.
[3] Wolf, ibid. p. 187.
[4] Diog. Laert. ix. 113.
[5] B.c. 260—184. Ritschl, loc. cit.
[6] Schol. Buttm. ad loc.
[7] B.c. 224—152. Ritschl, loc. cit.

afterwards constituted the standard text of both poems, the same, it is understood, which, with subsequent modifications, has been transmitted to the present day.[1] The merits of Aristarchus, like those of the great majority of professional grammarians in every age, consisted rather in acuteness of verbal criticism, than in refinement of taste or the faculty of appreciating the higher excellences of his author. A large portion, however, of his speculations were devoted to this more delicate branch of his art. With much audacity in censuring and condemning, or in suggesting additions and improvements from his own stores, he yet appears to have confined those liberties to his commentary, rarely if ever venturing on any serious alteration of the text not justified by competent authority.

Chorizontes, or Separatists.

7. During, or shortly prior to, the time of Aristophanes, the opinion was started as to the separate authorship of the Iliad and Odyssey.[2] Its first proposer was a certain Xenon, concerning whom, beyond the simple fact of his having originated this theory, history is silent. The only adherent of his views recorded by name was Hellanicus, a disciple of the school of Zenodotus. Their doctrine was controverted by Aristarchus, but seems otherwise to have obtained little attention, still less approbation, among the antient critics. During the subsequent virulent controversies on almost every other point, no difference of opinion is here recorded between the chiefs of opposite sects. The notices of such difference in any quarter consist but of incidental references by the scholiasts to the Chorizontes, or Separatists, as the

[1] Wolf, Prol. p. 241.

[2] See infra, Ch. xvi.

followers of Xenon were called. Seneca[1] mentions the question as one of the unprofitable subtleties which amused Greek sophists; while Longinus, the most genial of all the later Homeric critics, in treating at large of the difference of subject and character in the two poems, makes no allusion to so much as a doubt of their common authorship.

Crates. School of Pergamus.

To the sect of Aristarchus was opposed that of Crates[2] of Mallos, founder of a rival school of grammarians at Pergamus, under the auspices of Attalus, sovereign of that state. He was author of an edition of the poems, and, however inferior in general popularity, was no unworthy antagonist of the great Alexandrian. Of the readings of the text recorded as having been disputed between the two, those of Crates are frequently entitled to a preference, and some have been preferred accordingly in subsequent editions. He also numbers among his adherents several leading grammarians of later times. His speculations on the age and life of the poet are marked by originality, occasionally tending to paradox.[3]

Division of the text into books.

In early times the only subdivision of the text was by heads of subjects, or rhapsodies, as some of the more comprehensive heads were called, embodying the parts usually allotted in the public rehearsals to different performers.[4] Thus what is now comprised

[1] De Brevit. Vit. xiii.

[2] B. C. 160.

[3] Suid. in v.; conf. Wolf, Prol. p. 276.; B. Thiersch, Zeitalt. Homers, p. 18. sq. The other editions by grammarians of inferior note, of which mention occurs, were: those of Callistratus, Sosigenes, and Philemon, of the Alexandrian school (Villois. Præf. ad Schol. Ven. p. 23.); the Cyclic edition, that, namely, embodied in the Alexandrian collection of Cyclic poems (Schol. Buttm. ad Odyss. π. 195. p. 25.); and one by Tyrannio, freedman of Cicero (Suid. in v.). Conf. Lehrs, de Aristarch. studd. Homer. p. 29. sq.

[4] Heyn. ad Il. vol. VIII. p. 787.

in the fifth and a portion of the sixth book of the Iliad was called the "Prowess of Diomed." The ninth book was named "Litæ," or the "Supplication." The second contains the "Dream," and the "Bœotia" or "Catalogue." The present division into twenty-four books of unequal length is attributed to Aristarchus.[1] In the edition[2] of Crates, however, the text (of each poem, it may be presumed) appears to have been divided into but nine books; each, consequently, of more than double the average bulk of those of Aristarchus. The method of Crates was in conformity with that adopted in the other Homeric poems supposed to have been similarly subdivided by the Alexandrian critics. The Thebaïs and Epigoni contained each seven books; the Cypria eleven; the Æthiopis five; the Lesser Iliad and Nosti each four. Although no exact notice is extant of the entire length of any one of these works, there can be little doubt, from the existing abstract of their contents, or the general allusions of the antients, that they were of sufficient bulk to admit of their cantos containing an average number of lines double that allotted to each of the four and twenty Aristarchean rhapsodies. The same method was followed by Apollonius Rhodius, himself an Alexandrian grammarian, in his Argonautica. The arrangement of Aristarchus was therefore a departure from the ordinary practice. But his boundless authority in the later schools

[1] Plut. Vit. Hom. iv.; Eustath. Proœm. ad Il. p. 5.

[2] Suid. v. Κράτης. There seems no ground for taking the term διόρθωσις, as here used by Suidas, in any other sense than its ordinary one of Edition. The phrase for a mere "correcting commentary," as distinct from a "corrected text," is τὰ διορθωτικά. Vill. Præf. ad Sch. Ven. p. 31.

secured his method universal acquiescence, and that of Crates seems to have been limited to his own edition.

Later grammarians.

The labours of succeeding grammarians during the better days of classical literature, of Dionysius Thrax, Didymus, and others, shed but little additional light on the text or history of the poems. They were confined, in great measure, to controversies between the adherents of the rival schools of the Alexandrian era, or to vindications of the opinions, and revisals of the editions, of their respective chiefs. To the middle or lower ages of the Byzantine empire belong the whole or greater part of the extant scholia, which are chiefly valuable as affording access to the views and opinions of authors of a better period.[1]

Modern history of the poems. Vico. Wolf.

8. During the first few centuries after the revival of letters, modern classical scholars were content to acquiesce in the prevailing doctrine of the antient public, which, while restricting the honour of emanating from Homer to the Iliad and Odyssey alone, among the poems that formerly claimed it, admitted them both as his genuine integral works. But towards the end of the 17th century certain novelties of opinion began to transpire, tending to place the whole question in a light different from any in which it had been contemplated by the leading antient critics.[2] The first attempt to combine these speculations into a

[1] For the bibliography of Homer, the number, age, or relative credit of the existing manuscripts, editions, or commentaries, antient and modern, see generally, Bernhardy, Grundr. der Griech. Lit. pt. II. p. 117. sqq.; and Hoffmann, Bibliogr. Lex. der Gr. Lit. pt. II. p. 314.

[2] Casaub. and Menag. ad Diog. Laert. ix. 13.; Perizon. Animadv. hist. vi.; Bentley, Phileleuth. Lips. pt. I. § 7.; Hédelin d'Aubignac, Conject. academ.; Perrault, Parall. des Anc. et Mod. 1692, vol. III. p. 33. sq.

methodical form is contained in the Scienza nuova of Giambattista Vico. This eccentric Neapolitan was an original thinker of no ordinary stamp, whose opinions, as remarkable for novelty and ingenuity as deficient in solidity, overlooked or neglected in his own day, have, in various instances, anticipated theories destined to obtain for their more recent propounders the fame of original discovery. In a treatise upon Homer, embodied in the above-cited work, there occurs, among many valuable remarks, mingled with an equal amount of error and paradox, the following passage: "Herein we must admire the hand of Providence, that at a time when alphabetic writing was not yet invented, men should sometimes discourse in verse, which, by the aid of rhythm or metre, might facilitate the action of the memory in more effectually preserving the vicissitudes of national history. . . . . Homer left none of his compositions in writing, as we are told by Fl. Josephus, in his Tract against Apion: but the rhapsodists went about singing the books separately, some one some the other, at the feasts and public solemnities of the Greek cities. The Pisistratidæ first divided and arranged, or caused to be so arranged, the poems of Homer into Iliad and Odyssey, whence we may judge what a confused collection of materials they must previously have been."[1] This extract contains the germ and substance of that theory which, nearly a century afterwards, reproduced and extended, with all the array of profound scholarship, in the form of an elaborate dissertation, obtained its author a first

[1] Ed. Milan. 1836, vol. v. p. 478. 480. Elsewhere he speaks of a "Homer of the Iliad" and a "Homer of the Odyssey."

rank among historical critics, and became the foundation of a new school of classical research.

The publication of Wolf's Prolegomena, or Prefatory Essay to the Iliad, in which his views were developed, took place during a crisis in the intellectual as well as political destinies of Europe. A bold spirit of speculative inquiry was then abroad, the valuable effects of which, in exploding error and prejudice, have been too often counterbalanced by the spread of groundless or mischievous innovation. While the antiquity or universality of any doctrine was a powerful attraction to sceptical assault, few but such as were fenced on all sides by impenetrable barriers of demonstrated fact were safe from the danger of falling, at least a temporary sacrifice to zeal for some conjectural novelty. Wolf himself professed the scope of his argument to be rather to subvert the antient fabric of opinion, than to erect any solid edifice in its place; and the result has justified the accuracy of the figure. The publication of his essay may be compared to that of a pamphlet containing specious revolutionary doctrines in a hitherto tranquil state, at the moment when the minds of men were ripe for political change. Unanimous in rejecting their old form of government, scarcely any two citizens can agree as to that to be adopted in its stead. A period of discord is followed by one of anarchy, and that, in its turn, by a gradual inclination to revert to the former system.

Wolf's views, partly also suggested by the elegant and ingenious essay of Robert Wood[1], are in so far an extension or modification of those of Vico,

[1] On the original genius of Homer, 1769.

that he ascribes, in more positive terms than the Italian critic, the previously undigested materials of each poem to a variety of authors; and assumes them to have been, not only first arranged, but first committed to writing, by Pisistratus. This latter service Vico, most preposterously, supposes to have been first rendered them by the Alexandrian grammarians. Beyond these general heads, it is not very easy to gather Wolf's precise doctrines, from the vague and often self-contradictory mode in which they are stated. Sometimes he speaks as if each work contained a primitive kernel of epic unity, enlarged by an extension of the main subject, or the addition of episodes, in its gradual descent to posterity, but not digested on any consistent plan prior to the days of Pisistratus. Elsewhere each seems to be considered as a chaos of unconnected elements, first compiled and adjusted by the same Attic hero of each version of his fluctuating theory. At other times he attaches importance to the question, whether the two poems are by the same Homer or different Homers, which would seem at least a virtual admission of each being substantially by a single author. In one place he altogether denies the familiar use of writing for literary purposes prior to the age of Pisistratus; in another he allows that its benefits may have been extended several centuries earlier to the works of other Greek poets, but not to those of Homer; a hypothesis the very reverse of what all reasonable probability would seem to justify.[1] The only spe-

[1] On these and other inconsistencies of Wolf, see Clint. Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 370. It may safely be asserted, that, were the principles of Wolf's school of commentary to be enforced against his own Prolegomena, that essay could not possibly, in its integrity, be the work of the same author.

cific facts by which he can be said to abide are, that the component elements of each poem, whether by few or by many authors, neither possessed any such epic continuity as they now exhibit, nor were committed to writing, until those services were rendered to them by Pisistratus, about the middle of the sixth century before Christ.

Subsequent vicissitudes of the "Homeric question."

9. If the opinions of the master were so unsettled, harmony among his disciples could the less be expected. His extreme view of a total denial of written preservation to Homer, up to so recent a period, by his fondly admiring countrymen, and to Homer alone among their early poets, found but few supporters. Nor was the title of Pisistratus to have first imparted epic consistency to the poems very generally recognised. The basis however of the theory, that they were neither committed to writing till long after the period of their composition, nor originally composed in their integral form, obtained a general acquiescence. While the historical arguments, on which Wolf principally laid stress, ascribing the functions of first compiler as well as writer to Pisistratus, were disregarded, the internal evidence, as it was called, of discrepancy in matter or style between different parts was more prominently put forward. The favourite field for critical acumen now became the analysis, or rather dissection, of the text; and a large portion of the scholarship of the age has been exhausted in efforts to prove, by a very pointless, for the most part, and tasteless course of hypercritical subtlety, that the works which had hitherto been admired and honoured by the greatest critics of every period as standard models of epic art, were but an ill digested chaos of originally unconnected atoms, teem-

ing with incongruities and absurdities of the grossest description.[1]

A certain encouragement was held out to this style of commentary by the circumstance of its being in some degree countenanced by antient example. In the infancy of Greek critical art, when its object was rather to appreciate the higher attributes of genius than detect its petty blemishes, the surpassing excellence of the Iliad and Odyssey led to their being set up as a type of absolute perfection in poetical composition. The admiration of the work was transferred naturally to the author. The production of two such poems seemed to require, not only an original genius of the highest order, but a great proficiency in the technical rules, and an ample store of the aids, of grammatical and rhetorical science. The principles of this school are concisely stated in one of its own trite aphorisms: that "to wrest the thunderbolt from Jupiter, the club from Hercules, or a line from the text of the Iliad was an equally impossible undertaking."[2] By a natural reaction, this enthusiasm provoked, in the maturer stages of grammatical science, no less zealous endeavours to detect flaws in these boasted models of perfection. Although there appears no intention on the part of any school of antient criticism to dispute a general unity of plan in the poems, still, wherever it seemed that a phrase, verse, or integral part, could be spared without an entire sacrifice of poetical continuity, it seldom failed, in some quarter or other, to be condemned as an excrescence on the original fabric, whether an afterthought of the poet or a corruption of transcribers and rhapsodists. In the minor details of the text

[1] See Append. A.

[2] Heyn. ad Il. ω. vol. VIII. p. 799.

there were no limits to this license. Taking, therefore, into account the extension given to the same system in our own time, it might safely be pronounced, that, were all the portions so stigmatised by successive generations of critics to be discarded, the fate of the poems would resemble that of the picture exposed in the market-place, with a request that each passing dilettante would draw a brush through the part that appeared to him defective. The consequence was, that in a few hours not an entire feature could be distinguished.

In spite, however, of these aberrations of taste or judgement on the part of his disciples, it cannot be denied that Wolf conferred a real benefit on classical science, by opening up the field of rational scepticism which has inherited his name. The popular view of the history of the poems demanded, no doubt, in the absence of all authentic notice of their author, a more searching scrutiny than it had yet undergone. The composition of two works of so elaborate a structure in the semibarbarous period from which they were held to emanate, was in itself a striking phenomenon. While the mode or extent of their committal to writing at the same early period was involved in much obscurity, their preservation in so perfect a state, unwritten, appeared little less than a miracle. Nor could it be overlooked that, amid a general unity, their text offered discrepancies of detail which, though certainly not greater than can be detected in similar works of civilised epochs, held out legitimate handle for speculation. The full discussion to which these various points have, during the last fifty years, been subjected, in themselves and in their bearings on others of collateral interest in Greek

philology, if not productive of any conclusive settlement of the main question, has certainly proved of infinite benefit to the general cause of classical criticism.[1]

The data for regulating the judgement in all such inquiries may be classed under two principal heads: I. Historical authority, comprising, besides the testimony of native authors, the balance of tradition, of received opinion, and of general probability: II. The internal evidence of the poems themselves. These two sources of knowledge are indeed often so closely interwoven as scarcely to admit of their being treated altogether independantly of each other. It will yet be proper, for method's sake, to keep them in as far as possible distinct. The internal evidence is now admitted to be by far the most important, the only basis indeed of any sound conclusions. It will, therefore, be analysed hereafter in considerable detail. The historical evidence possesses, however, a prior claim on attention.

[1] Subjoined is a notice of the principal authors who have advocated in whole, or for the most part, the doctrines of Wolf: C. F. Francoson, Essai sur la Question, si Homère, &c.; F. Schlegel, Gesch. der Ep. Dichtk. viii.; Heyne, Obss. ad Il.; W. Müller, Homer. Vorschule; B. Thiersch, Urgestalt der Odyssee; Hermann, Opusc. vol. v. p. 52. sqq., vol. vi. p. 70. sqq.; Ritschl, Die Alexandrin. Biblioth.; Lachmann, Betrachtungen üb. die Ilias; Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. ii. ch. xxi.

The following are such as have entertained middle or opposite views: Ste. Croix, Réfutation, &c., de M. Wolf; Hug, Erfindung der Buchstabenschrift; Kreuser, Vorfragen üb. Homer; Clinton, Fast. Hell. vol. i. p. 366.; Coleridge, Introd. to the Study of the Gr. Classics; Quarterly Review, vol. xliv. p. 121.; Welcker, Der Epische Cyclus, p. 122. sqq.; K. O. Müller, Hist. of Gr. Lit; Thirlwall, Hist. of Greece, app. to vol. i. 2nd ed.; Payne Knight, Prolegg. ad Hom.; Nitzsch, de Hist. Homeri; Artikel Odyssee in d. Hallisch. Encycl.; Erklärende Anmkk. zur Odyssee. The two last-mentioned authors are the leading supporters of the Separatist doctrine.

CHAP. III.

HOMER.—ORIGIN OF THE POEMS.—HISTORICAL DATA.

1. AUTHORITIES CONCERNING PISISTRATUS AND HIS COMPILATION.—2. VARIETIES OF THEORY BASED ON THOSE AUTHORITIES.—3. SILENCE OF THE EARLIER CLASSICS. ARGUMENT FROM THE CYCLIC POEMS.—4. WHAT WERE THE POEMS OF "HOMER" "COLLECTED AND ARRANGED" BY PISISTRATUS.—5. JUST ESTIMATE OF HIS HOMERIC LABOURS.

Authorities concerning Pisistratus and his compilation.

1. In the modern schools, the "Homeric question" resolves itself into two main heads of speculative inquiry: first, whether the Iliad and Odyssey are to be considered as each in its integral capacity the work of a single author: secondly, how far, allowing this to be the case, both poems are to be ascribed to the same author. It is to the former head alone that the historical class of evidence can be said to apply. The other, or as it is technically called the Separatist question, can hardly be said to offer materials for such investigation, being alluded to by the antients but as a subtlety of one or two commentators of no authority, whose views were repudiated or contemned by the best native critics. It is on grounds of internal evidence that so great importance has been attached to the Separatist doctrine in our own times, and upon these grounds alone it will here accordingly fall to be considered.

With the above limitation, the historical element of the inquiry concentrates itself around the tradition concerning the services rendered to the poems by Pisistratus and his family. This is owing partly to the importance of those services, partly to the pecu-

liar prominence assigned them throughout the late discussion. Of the Athenian usurper himself no mention occurs in connexion with the works of Homer, in the text of any writer of the best days of Greek literature; but a passage of the Platonic dialogue[1] which bears as its title the name of "Hipparchus," son and successor of Pisistratus, and which is the earliest extant authority on the subject, ascribes to the same Hipparchus, not only the first establishment at Athens of the public rehearsal of the poems, but their first introduction into that republic. This account is however so grossly improbable in itself, and so contrary to all other more reasonable data, that it has never been considered more than a confused version of the prevailing tradition of certain improvements having been effected by a member of the family in the festive recitals of the poems. But even this more restricted view of their services is not borne out by other authorities. Dieuchidas, a Megarian writer of uncertain age but good credit, quoted by Diogenes Laertius in his life of Solon[2], ascribes the same or similar improvements to that lawgiver, subjoining the remark, that "Solon therefore had done more than Pisistratus to elucidate the poems." He mentions in the sequel the imputed interpolation, by Solon, of the passage of the Catalogue relative to the isle of Salamis. From these various data, it may be inferred that there were three traditions current in later times, as to the better regulation of the public rehearsals in Athens; one of which ascribed it to Solon, another to Pisistratus, a third to his son Hipparchus. The two latter may be presumed to imply the extension or improvement, by those

[1] p. 228. [2] ix.

princes, of the original ordinance of Solon. The next allusion to the services of Pisistratus is by Cicero[1], who describes him as "reported to have arranged the books of Homer, previously in a state of confusion, in the form in which we now possess them." Pausanias[2] mentions his collection of the poet's previously scattered works as a current rumour, and alludes also to certain assistants in his task. Ælian[3] combines the two notices relative to Lycurgus and Pisistratus into one, assigning to the former the first introduction of the poems into Greece, but in a disordered state; to the latter their final arrangement. But the most explicit notice of the critical labours of Pisistratus is a somewhat mutilated fragment of Tzetzes, the Byzantine grammarian[4], to the following effect: "Pisistratus collected the scattered poems of Homer, and with much care and diligence arranged them into the volumes which they now occupy, with the aid of four distinguished scholars: Conchylus of . . . . , Onomacritus of Athens, Zopyrus of Heraclea, and Orpheus of Croton." "Before his time," it is added, "the study of Homer was a confused and difficult matter." Josephus[5] does not mention Pisistratus, but states it to be an opinion entertained in some quarters, that "the poems of Homer were not committed to writing until long after their composition, but handed down by memory, and afterwards collected into one volume; which," he adds, "may account for the many discrepancies in their text."

The services here described as rendered by Pisi-

[1] De Orat. III. xxxiv. [2] VII. xxvi.; conf. Eust. præf. p. 5.

[3] Var. Hist. XIII. xiv.

[4] Ritschl, Die Alexandr. Biblioth. p. 3.; conf. Cramer, Anecd. Gr. vol. I. p. 6.; Bernh. Grundr. der Gr. Lit. vol. II. p. 68. sq.

[5] Contr. Ap. I. ii.

stratus to the poems are: first, the encouragement and regulation of their public recital; secondly, their collection and arrangement in their present form.

Varieties of theory based on them.

2. The modern theories on either point are of the same vague character as the testimonies on which they are based. The doctrine of Wolf, the extreme of Philo-Pisistratism, assumed the Attic tyrant to be the first writer as well as compiler, and hence, in so far as their epic unity is concerned, the first actual author of an Iliad or Odyssey, previously a confused mass of heroic songs. Others have run into an opposite extreme, limiting his merit to little more than having, in concert with Solon, provided for the performance of the public rehearsals, according to the epic sequel originally inherent in the cantos, but disturbed in the popular schools of rhapsodism. A third party, adopting a middle course, would ascribe to him, together with the regulation of the popular rehearsals, the preparation of a complete edition of the whole series of cantos or books, previously extant in writing, but without any standard integral text, and hence liable to be perverted from their epic continuity. Other modifications of opinion might be enumerated, but those above stated will suffice to place in a clear light the bearings of the general question.

The first of these three views, the primary Wolfian hypothesis, now numbers comparatively few supporters. Not one of the various authorities cited in its favour ascribes to Pisistratus the committal of the poems to writing. Tzetzes, the most specific and apparently authentic historian of his labours, is not only silent upon this point, but the terms of the above-cited passage, describing an association of pro-

fessional men of letters engaged in preparing complete editions of the national classics, imply a state of Greek literature altogether incompatible with the denial of a written integrity to its acknowledged standard; to the Greek bible, as Wolf[1] himself calls the Iliad. Aristotle[2], the oldest and best authority concerning the early promulgation of the poems in Greece, was not only ignorant of this later form of the tradition, but indirectly contradicts it, describing the Spartan lawgiver as having in the course of his travels, several centuries prior to the time of Pisistratus, received the poems as written documents from Creophilus of Samos, and brought them to Lacedæmon. Whatever may be the critical value of this story, it proves at least that those who attached weight to it knew nothing of any prior claim of Athens to the first written arrangement of the poems. Xenophanes[3] of Colophon and Theagenes[4] of Rhegium, both contemporary with Pisistratus, wrote commentaries on Homer. But a written commentary on a work itself unwritten is surely a thing unheard of. Still less compatible were the labours of these critics with a mass of undigested ballads as their text-book. Nor can the authorities most laudatory of Pisistratus reasonably be understood as asserting his having first imparted epic unity to the poems, or as expressing any doubt of its prior existence. They allude rather to the restoration of a previous order dislocated by the popular organs of transmission. Cicero[5], the oldest

[1] Vorlesung. üb. d. Ilias, vol. I. p. 7.
[2] Ap. Heraclid. Polit. frg. II. ed. Schneidewin.
[3] Frgg. vii. xxxi.; conf. Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 186.
[4] Vill. Præf. ad Sch. Ven. p. 25.; Nitzsch, Hist. Hom. pt. I. p. 51.
[5] Orat. III. xliii.

and gravest among them, could hardly have applied the expression "books (libros), before confused and dispersed," to hitherto unwritten and unconnected songs. The term books must either denote in its familiar sense written volumes, or if it be understood in the figurative sense of cantos or heads of subject, it implies an existence of the body of the work to which they belonged. Nor can confusion or dispersion be said to prevail, where order and unity were never contemplated. With how little justice Cicero can be made responsible for the opinion here imputed to him appears from another passage of his works, allusive to the state of literature in Greece many generations anterior to Pisistratus. "If," says he[1], "we place the foundation of Rome in the 7th Olympiad (750 B. C.), that event would coincide with a period at which Greece abounded with poets and musicians, and when, consequently, less weight attached to fabulous tradition." The orator here clearly alludes to a Greek literature in the technical sense of the term, about two hundred years prior to Pisistratus; he cannot, therefore, possibly have been under the impression that Homer, among all these poets, was denied a written text till the age of that prince. Even Josephus[2], the only author who questions the fact of the poems having been written by Homer himself, is by no means favourable to the claims of Pisistratus. The tract in which he alludes to the subject is an elaborate attempt to depreciate, in a keen spirit of national controversy, the antiquity of Greek civilisation and learning. His neglect, therefore, either to quote authorities or specify dates

[1] De Repub. II. x.

[2] C. Ap. I. ii.

warrants the opinion, that, if he had ever heard of any such tradition relative to the Pisistratidæ, he did not consider it sufficiently valid for his purpose. Had he been able to quote, as easily as Wolf[1] has imagined, "the unanimous voice of all previous antiquity" in favour of his views, his triumph over Apion would have been complete, without an additional word of argument. It is indeed remarkable that, while the whole of the authors cited in behalf of the modern doctrine belong to the Roman period, and with the exception of Cicero to its decline, not one of them attempts to corroborate his own statement by more antient or nearly contemporaneous authority. The greater the accumulation of such unsupported statements, the greater, obviously, the evidence of the hollowness of the tradition they repeat. Where, on the other hand, appeal does happen to be made, as by Diogenes Laertius, to prior authority, the testimony cited, that of Dicæchidas[2], the earliest writer who alludes to the Athenian usurper, is subversive of his more exaggerated claims, implying that the unity of the poems had been already better provided for by Solon.

Silence of the earlier classics.

3. Apart from such more specific reasons, it seems impossible to reconcile with the modern doctrine the entire silence of the writers of the best ages of Greece on the subject, and the absence of all appearance of doubt on their part, amid their accumulated notices of the poems, as to the genuine original integrity of the text. This objection has been met by a denial of any obligation on the part of those writers, in their incidental allusions to a popular literary work, to

[1] Prol. p. 142.

[2] Ap. Diog. in Vit. Solonis, ix.

discuss its origin or early transmission. In so far as restricted to such allusions, the apology may have weight. It does not, however, meet the present case. Plato often does, and even Aristotle may at times, though that is perhaps more doubtful, quote, not merely Homer or Hesiod, but Orpheus or Musæus, in passing illustration of some speculative doctrine, without being held to any serious admission of the genuine character of the work appealed to: but that the proverbially sceptical and punctilious Stagirite critic, in a regular treatise on the Art of Poetry[1], should adopt the Iliad and Odyssey as his standard models of epic unity, and speak of Homer, in his strictly personal capacity, as the inspired author of so wonderful a combination, if he knew that the poems were really indebted for this noblest feature of their composition to a bookmaker of a comparatively recent epoch, seems incredible. As little can it be supposed that Aristotle could be ignorant of any very important fact in the history of either Homer, Pisistratus, or Solon, which was matter of notoriety in the time of Cicero. This negative argument has, however, also been met in another and perhaps a more specious form. "Such speculative questions," it has been urged, "do not belong to the more youthful and genial stages of literary criticism, but to those later epochs, in which philological research is pursued as a distinct branch of science. Plato or Aristotle, satisfied with the possession of their Homer, limit their commentary to the beauties of the transmitted text, without investigating how, or through what medium, they obtained it." This rule of interpretation is at the best very ques-

[1] De Arte Poetic. passim.

tionable, but its presumed application to the case fails entirely. The Alexandrian commentators, it will be admitted, were as subtle a race of speculative critics as ever existed; yet they were no less in the dark as to the modern theory, than their ancestors of the Attic period. Not a hint of any such theory can be found in their remains. The argument that their opinions are but partially represented in the existing scholia cannot here avail. It were in itself hardly conceivable, that among such an infinity of citations, from the commentaries of several hundred grammarians[1], all allusion to a point of so great interest should be omitted, especially by authors fond of giving effect to precisely this subtle class of notices. But the prominence actually assigned, in the same Alexandrian schools, to the more limited scepticism of the Chorizontes, the minor proposition it may be called, as to a twofold authorship, is conclusive evidence that the major, of a complete patchwork Homer, would not, if already mooted, have been overlooked. The summary manner in which the Separatist doctrine itself is dismissed by Aristarchus, and other leading commentators, convincingly proves that the more extended theory of subdivision, if known to them at all, could not have been countenanced by them. Those who insisted on ascribing both poems to a single author could never have admitted a multitude for each.

Still more conclusive is the historical argument in favour of an entire Iliad and Odyssey, centuries prior to the age of Pisistratus, derived from those other epic poems to which attention has already been

Argument from the Cyclic poems.

[1] See Fabric. Bib. Gr. Harl. vol. I. p. 440. sqq.

directed, as also vulgarly ascribed to Homer, with claims to an antiquity little inferior to that of his genuine works. Those poems, unfortunately, no longer exist in their integrity. Several of them, however, as may be collected from their remains or the notices concerning them, contained, in the choice of their subjects and mode of treatment, proofs of a systematic imitation of the Iliad and Odyssey, and, by consequence, of a familiarity with their text as already extant in the form in which we now possess it. To enter in detail upon the evidence bearing on this point would be to anticipate what properly belongs to another place.[1] Attention, however, may here be called to the following particulars. In the first place it will be remarked, that, while a veneration for the great master induced the disciples or imitators to select subjects connected with those on which he had shed lustre, a similar feeling, or the fear of entering into competition with him, also led them to avoid encroaching on the ground he had occupied. Aretinus, the next most celebrated poet of the school, took up, in his Æthiopis, the series of adventures before Troy, precisely at the stage in which the Iliad ceases, and carried them on to the death of Ajax. The Lesser Iliad continued the interrupted tale to the fall of the city, which catastrophe was also treated by Aretinus in a work entitled the Destruction of Troy. The author of the Cypria treated the previous subject from the birth of Helen, and brought it down to the exact epoch at which the Iliad commences. The Nosti filled up the interval between Iliad and Odyssey. Each of these works, while vastly inferior both in

[1] See infra, Ch. xix.

design and execution to their two prototypes, emulated at least the comprehensive scope of their action, borrowing also from them much of their own epic machinery, such as catalogues of warriors, quarrels among the chiefs, funeral games, and other similar details. To these Cyclic or Homeric epopees might be added numerous others[1], such as the Corinthiaca of Eumelus, and Heraclea of Pisander, standing in no such immediate relation to the Iliad, but also emanating from a more or less remote antiquity, and of great length and elaborate structure. The evidence supplied by these facts, that the Iliad and Odyssey existed previously to the Olympic era, can only be evaded by assuming all those poems to have been also originally composed on no definite plan, nor by any single author, but to have been indebted for their existence to the same fortuitous cohesion or the same bookmaking artifice, as the Pisistratian Homer. This is an extreme of paradox, such as, with our present clearer insight into the early history of Greek epic literature, will hardly find acceptance in any reasonable quarter.

Another evidence that Homer's name was from the earliest period identified with regular epic compositions is the fact, that while a large proportion of the works of that class claiming a remote antiquity were familiarly ascribed to him, none such were ever assigned to the rival school of Hesiod. With this name, by equal priority of right, was connected, in the same conventional usage, that other voluminous body of hexameter poems already described as chiefly of a didactic tendency, or, where treating

[1] Infra, Ch. xxii.

heroic subjects, of a brief or desultory character. This distinction, and by consequence the respective peculiarities on which it is founded, is certainly far older than the time of Pisistratus.

What were the poems collected and arranged by Pisistratus?

4. And here a question occurs of no little moment as bearing on this whole inquiry, but which has hitherto been overlooked or but lightly treated: What were the "poems of Homer" which Pisistratus, in the tradition, is described as collecting and arranging? Were they limited to the Iliad and Odyssey? or did they comprise other members of the "Homeric" Cycle? Although the Iliad and Odyssey came gradually, in the progress of the critical art, by the force rather of internal than historical evidence, to be recognised as the sole genuine works of "the poet," yet this, it has been shown, was not the case in early times. It was not so, probably, in the age of Simonides and Pindar[1], scarcely in that of Herodotus, and, it may confidently be said, not certainly in that of Pisistratus. There can be no reasonable doubt that the "poems of Homer," forbidden to be rhapsodised at Sicyon by Clisthenes, tyrant of that state and contemporary of Pisistratus, on account of the prominence they gave to the glory of the rival city of Argos, comprised the Thebaïs and Epigoni[2]; and it can hardly be supposed that any more critical line of distinction had yet been drawn in Athens. Were, however, the tradition of an adjustment or redaction of the "previously scattered" limbs or volumes of "Homer," to be thus understood of the general mass or series of Homeric poems, the result would be a com-

[1] Ap. Welck. Ep. Cyc. p. 199. 300.

[2] See Grote, Hist. of Gr. vol. ii. p. 173.; who, however, goes too far in excluding the Iliad and Odyssey.

plete change in the bearings of the whole question as affecting the Iliad and Odyssey alone. The text of Tzetzes, above cited, also certainly favours this view. The duties performed by Pisistratus and his coadjutors towards "Homer" are there mentioned but incidentally, in the way of illustration or parallel to the like undertaking of Zenodotus in the Alexandrian period.[1] But the compilation of that critic included, it is certain, the apocryphal as well as the genuine works of "Homer." From other collateral accounts it appears that Pisistratus also compiled and arranged the poems of Hesiod[2], which title, in like manner, comprised, besides the two more accredited works of the Bœotian bard, numerous others enjoying, in more critical ages, little or no claim to genuine Hesiodic origin; and there seems no sufficient reason to draw a distinction, as to the value of any such generic expression, between the case of Hesiod and that of Homer. The simple fact that the remaining mass of Epico-Homeric poems were collected by Pisistratus, under whatever title, can hardly admit of doubt. He was the founder, as Zenodotus with whom he is compared by Tzetzes was the director, of a public library.[3] His "Collection and Arrangement" of the "Poems of Homer" for his Athenian Institute may, therefore, in the general spirit of the tradition, safely be understood in the same comprehensive sense as that of his Alexandrian successor for the shelves of the Musæum.[4] The whole series would not only be

[1] Ritschl, Die Alex. Bibl. p. 3.

[2] Müll. Proleg. zu ein. wissent. Mythol. p. 399.

[3] Wolf, Prol. p. 145.; Nitzsch, Hist. Hom. pt. 1. p. 102.

[4] Further evidence in favour of this view will be found in two short articles on the subject in the Rheinische Museum (1849, p. 135. sq.); one by K. L. Koth, the other by Professor Ritschl of Bonn. From the additional

required for the Athenian library, but must have formed the most bulky portion of its contents. Unless, therefore, it be assumed that the popular title to Homeric honours, which the Thebaïs, Cypria, Æthiopis, and Lesser Iliad had enjoyed for ages, and continued to retain long after the time of Pisistratus, was dismissed or set at naught by that compiler, at the epoch too when the Iliad and Odyssey themselves are asserted to have been but disjointed and unconnected fragments, (a somewhat extravagant hypothesis,) it seems difficult to escape the inference, that the "volumes of Homer," collected and arranged at Athens, comprehended a great deal more than those to which the title is now exclusively limited. The circumstance that the Homeric labours of the Athenian prince should have been understood, as certainly appears to have been the case, by later writers, as limited to the Iliad and Odyssey, can create no surprise. It furnishes but one, among numerous instances, where the expression "Homer," applied in early times to the collective Homeric mass, has been similarly misunderstood in after ages.

The establishment of a public library by Pisistratus, although perhaps the best authenticated fact of his literary history, is in itself singularly inconsistent with the more exaggerated view of his editorial functions. The notion of a professional

illustrations there supplied of the mutilated scholion of Tzetzes (supra, p. 205.), it appears probable that in that scholion the obscure word Coneylus, formerly supposed to be the name of one of the coadjutors of Pisistratus, is, as Dr. Cramer had conjectured, a remnant of the phrase ἐπικόγκυκλον, or Epic Cycle. It would thus refer, not to the person of the commentator, but to the material on which his critical labours were bestowed. Epic Cycle, it need hardly be remarked, is but another name for the Collective Epic poems of the Homeric School.

book-collector being the first committer to writing of the works deposited in his library involves something very nearly akin to absurdity.[1] Equally incompatible with this theory, though often, strange to say, adduced in its favour, are the allusions by antient grammarians to single lines or short passages, as "interpolated" here and there, by Pisistratus or his coadjutors, on the genuine text, not only of Homer, but of Hesiod, Musæus, Orpheus, and other poets, real or imaginary, whose works they had the credit of collecting.[2] Such allusions, unless on the supposition, not merely of the poems having long previously enjoyed the benefit of a written integrity, but of there having already existed for each some fixed textual standard of that integrity, were altogether nugatory.

Just estimate of his Homeric labours.

5. Strong as may be the foregoing body of objections to the modern Pisistratian theory, they scarcely suffice to bear out the opposite extreme of opinion, where the services of the Attic prince are

[1] Wolf, however, finds no difficulty. Proleg. p. 145.: "Non reperio qui alii inesse potuerunt scriptores, quam aliquot poetæ, nuper demum vel ab ipsius jussu perscripti." These aliquot poetæ, it may be remarked, comprised: I. Of epic literature, besides Homer, the whole body of Homeric, or cyclic authors: Arctinus, Lesches, Hagias, Stasinus, and other inferior or anonymous poets and works of that school. II. The whole body of probably little less voluminous Hesiodic poems. III. Of Miscellaneous authors and works, epic or lyric, genuine and spurious, not immediately connected with either of those schools, may be numbered: Asius, Eumelus, Cinæthon, Pisander, Callinus, Archilochus, Epimenides, Aristeas, Abaris, Sappho, Alcæus, Arion, Alcman, Tyrtæus, Terpander, Stesichorus, Mimnermus, Solon, Orpheus, Musæus, &c.; in fact, more than a half of the whole standard poetical literature of Greece. It is surprising with what levity some of the most important questions of Greek literary history are dismissed or misrepresented by this critic.

[2] Diog. Laert. Vit. Solon. ix.; Plut. Vit. Thes. xx.; Schol. Odyss. λ. 604.; Paus. vii. xxvi.; Herodot. vii. vi.

restricted to a mere share in establishing the public rehearsal of the poems, and checking the license of the rhapsodists; although the arguments in favour even of this more limited view are not devoid of plausibility. Apart from the silence of earlier authorities, stress has been laid on the absence of allusion, by the Alexandrian critics, to any Athenian text, amid their frequent appeals to those of other states, such as Argos, Chios, or Marseilles. This silence, however, though incompatible with any such extensive influence on the poems as has been ascribed to Pisistratus, need not entirely exclude his title to the merit of having prepared an edition for his own immediate use and that of his native public. But any such edition, even if extant in later times, could have enjoyed no separate authority, and must have been comprehended, with sundry others, under the general head of "common" or "ordinary editions," occasionally cited in the extant scholia.[1]

The more rigid, therefore, the scrutiny to which the properly historical data bearing on this inquiry are subjected, the more conclusively favourable do they appear to the view embodied in the foregoing general summary of the history of the poems. I. That each was originally composed, in its substantial integrity and order, as we now possess it. II. That, in the course of their passage to posterity, this order, if not altogether obliterated, was yet so habitually disturbed by the popular organs of transmission as to threaten its permanent dissolution. III. On the advance of literary culture, a zealous determination manifested itself in various quarters, to check this

[1] See Append. B.

license, and enforce regularity in the public recitals established in the leading Greek states. IV. With this object, new editions were prepared, under public auspices, for the use of different republics. Such were the texts of Chios, Argos, and the other "Civic Editions;" such also that of Pisistratus, assuming it ever to have existed.

That this reduction to order of the poems, whatever may have been its precise nature, was provided for in various other cities besides Athens, apart from the indirect evidence of the "Civic Editions," is asserted on the same authority habitually appealed to in favour of the exclusive claims of Pisistratus.[1] There was this difference in the result, that, while those editions obtained fame and authority, the names of their compilers were not preserved. The edition of Athens, on the other hand, if it ever existed, lapsed into obscurity, while the memory of its compiler's zeal was magnified, during the literary ascendancy of Athens, with other local traditions of that state, into a form which has supplied a basis for the still more exaggerated theories of the modern school.

[1] Suid. v. Ὅμηρος.

CHAP. IV.

HOMER. ORIGIN OF THE POEMS. INTERNAL DATA.

1. PRESENT STATE OF THE HOMERIC QUESTION.—2. INTERNAL EVIDENCE OF TWO KINDS. BEARINGS OF EACH ON THE CASE OF HOMER.—3. ANALYSIS OF THE POEMS. GENERAL RULES FOR ITS GUIDANCE.—4. SIMILARITY AND DISCREPANCY OF STYLE. THEIR RELATIVE VALUE AS SOURCES OF INTERNAL EVIDENCE.—5. CONSISTENCY IN THE POET'S PORTRAITURE OF CHARACTER.—6. STATE OF SOCIETY WHICH PRODUCED THE POEMS.—7. ANTIQUITY OF THE HOMERIC EPOPEE. ILII-PERSIS OF DEMODOCUS.—8. SUBDIVISION OF THE FOLLOWING ANALYSIS.

Present state of the Homeric question.

1. It will be desirable, as preliminary to any general application of the internal data of the poems to the question of their origin, to have distinctly in view the leading varieties of opinion to be examined. These varieties may be classed under the four following heads: —

I. The old opinion of Aristotle, Aristarchus, Longinus, and the native public at large, that both poems are the work of a single Homer.

II. The doctrine of the Chorizontes, or Separatists, that each is the production of a single, but not of the same poet.

III. That a number of independant lays on the Trojan war and its consequences, emanating from various authors and epochs of the primitive minstrelsy, having been observed, at a more advanced period of literature, to comprise two continuous series of epic narrative, had been incorporated by an ingenious compiler into the existing form of an Iliad and Odyssey.

IV. That an original kernel, or skeleton, of each

poem had been, in the course of ages, amplified to the bulk each now presents, partly by an extension of the primary subject, partly by the incorporation of other independant lays or episodes.

The latter two of these heads are but a compendium or summary of a class of doctrines, which assume a great variety of shapes, as modified by the caprice of their respective advocates. They represent, conjointly, the substance of Wolf's from the first vague and pliable theory. The credit of that theory has been on the wane ever since the sensation excited by its novelty had so far subsided as to admit of its being subjected to a dispassionate scrutiny, and the current of opinion has long been setting slowly, but surely, in a retrograde course. That the German public, where this whole question has been chiefly agitated, should be ready, unconditionally, to abandon doctrines with which its claims to preeminence in classical research are so intimately associated, was hardly to be expected; yet the various modifications of theory which have been propounded even in the German schools, while evading any actual return to the old Aristotelian creed, are but so many steps in that direction. It is plain, for example, that, in the ratio in which the second and third of the above four varieties of opinion differ from each other, they approximate to the first. The second admits the unity of each poem and author, but draws a broad distinction between the two. The third, while it confounds the distinction, as broadly denies the unity. A concession, on either side, of but one of the points at issue, would amount to a recognition of the antient doctrine.

The literary historian who, some years ago, had

ventured on this next and last step might have been exposed to the stigma of lagging behind the spirit of the age, of narrow-minded deference to exploded error. By reference, however, to the existing state of opinion, he may now perhaps rather claim to rank as a sceptic than a bigot. His title to impartiality, at least, will hardly in the present instance be disputed, when it is stated that, on commencing the course of study preliminary to this undertaking, he was, like most young scholars, himself a zealous disciple of the Wolfian school. Having been led, by a twenty-years' diligent scrutiny of its doctrines, to a thorough conviction of their fallacy, he is the more alive to the duty of attempting, by a full exposition of the results of that scrutiny, to produce a similar conviction on the minds of others.

Internal evidence of two kinds.

2. The internal evidence of any such works as the Iliad or Odyssey, bearing on the question of their origin or structure, is of two kinds, Circumstantial and Personal; or, in the technical language of the schools, Objective and Subjective. The former hinges on a comparative view of the facts and events, the manners, customs, and institutions described or alluded to, as illustrative of the age or state of society from which the descriptions emanate. The evidence of the latter kind deals rather with the literary or imaginative than the historical element of the text, with the genius of the author rather than of his times or facts; but deals with them in a similar manner, by testing their unity or diversity as reflected in their written features of language, sentiment, or style.

Bearings of each on the present case.

The arguments derived from the former source affect chiefly the question of separate authorship in

the two poems. Any serious attempts to bring such arguments to bear against the individual integrity of each have been directed chiefly to portions of the text, the genuine character of which had been doubted by leading native critics, where, consequently, the discrepancy of the part, even where admitted, may be considered in some sense to imply the unity of the whole. The consideration, therefore, of the Circumstantial head of internal evidence will be reserved chiefly for those portions of this analysis devoted either to the Separatist theory, or to the corruptions which the text of either poem may, in the ordinary course of transmission, have undergone. The few points falling under this head to which it has been considered necessary here to direct attention resolve themselves, in great measure, into questions of historical probability similar to those treated in the previous chapter.

One of the most curious anomalies observable in the general course of Homeric criticism during the last half-century, is the familiar way in which, in the same quarters where the Iliad and Odyssey are pronounced a compilation of discordant materials derived from poets and epochs extending over about five centuries, both works, together with their "author" "Homer," continue to be quoted in their integrity as the most antient contemporary evidence on all questions of remotest Hellenic history, manners, art, or science. Great importance for example has been attached, after Thucydides, Strabo, and other classics, to the absence from either poem of the names Hellas, or Hellene, for Greece and its inhabitants, and of that of Peloponnesus for its southern peninsula, as historical evidence of the late period at which these

phrases became prevalent. But if the poems really be a cento of contributions by numerous authors from the tenth or eleventh centuries B. C. down to Solon and Pisistratus, any appeal to such uniformity must here involve one of two inferences: either that the phraseology in question was unknown during the whole of that period, which it is certain was not the case; or that the whole body of contributors had conspired in affecting ignorance, which were absurd. The omission therefore is in itself substantial evidence of unity, in the period at least in which the works were composed. Nor can the customary apology here avail, that deference to the usage of earlier bards whose songs form the basis of the compilation, might cause this phraseology to become inveterate with their successors, since both terms occur in the text of Hesiod and in that of Homer's oldest disciples and most successful imitators. The argument may be extended to other negative peculiarities in the poet's accounts of manners or institutions, whether referable to ignorance or other causes. That one Homer should have been ignorant of the use of cavalry in war, or from eccentricity or antiquarian affectation should have pretended to be so, is possible, but scarcely credible in the case of a number of Homers of different ages and countries. That one poet should systematically exclude from his heroes' tables fish, boiled meat, game, and other articles of good cheer, so much esteemed by heroes of other ages and countries, has often been remarked as singular; that ten or twelve Homers should enter into any such conspiracy against heroic freedom of diet seems unaccountable.

Among the reasons for assigning the two poems to

different authors, much importance has been attached to the preference of Iris in the one, of Mercury in the other, as the messenger of Jove. The force of this argument, as bearing on the Separatist question, will be considered hereafter. It tells, however, obviously both ways on the doctrines at large of the modern school. That two Homers should have preferred, the one the male the other the female functionary, were nothing surprising; but that out of a number of Homers, composing independently on the adventures of the Trojan war, all those who adopted Achilles as their hero and the military events of the siege as their subject, should have restricted themselves to the one, those who preferred the voyages of Ulysses, to the other class of agency, were a marvellous coincidence.

Many similar examples of consistency in the poet's historical notices might be adduced. The above will suffice to illustrate the principle of unity which they involve. Reserving, therefore, the further consideration of such questions for the comparative age or authorship of the separate poems, we now pass on to the more properly personal or *subjective* department of internal evidence, which will engage a large and well-merited share of attention.

Analysis of the poems. General rules for its guidance.

3. The critical analysis of a work of genius is limited, in ordinary cases, to the elucidation of its beauties, defects, or peculiarities. In the present case, not only the character of the poems, but their very existence, with that of their author, is at stake. This is unfortunate, as imparting a controversial spirit to a subject which, it were especially to be wished, should be treated in that easy agreeable tone with which polemical discussion is least compatible. Every

effort, however, will be made to merge the one head of inquiry in the other, so that the perception of the causes may flow naturally from that of the effects.

The internal evidence of the poems is now universally admitted to be the only source from which any clear light can be expected on their history; yet there is no branch of the whole Homeric question which has been so greatly neglected. Neither ingenuity nor subtlety has here, indeed, been spared by the supporters of the sceptical doctrine. Their attempts to prove too much may even have contributed at times to strengthen the case of their opponents. The complete mutilation, not merely of the entire poems, but of their separate limbs, paragraphs, and verses, which would ensue were effect given to those commentaries, would prove as incompatible with the existence of a fugitive ballad as of a finished epopee. They also tend by their own discrepancy to defeat each other. The flaw or blemish where one critic discovers plain evidence of patchwork, is passed over unheeded by another; while the text admitted by the first as a genuine fruit of the primitive heroic minstrelsy, is discarded by the second as the spurious offspring of a tasteless imitator. By the supporters of the old opinion, on the other hand, the arguments from this source, by far the most conclusive at their disposal, have been turned to comparatively slender account. The objections founded on the real or imputed discordances of the action have indeed been vigorously combated, but no attempt has been made to place the whole question on that higher ground of principle which it is capable of occupying. Unity of genius in such compositions can neither be proved nor set aside by reference to mere mechanical results. It

must be sought in those delicate traits of conception or feeling, where the variety of individual character in our species would seem, in itself, to preclude the possibility of so singular a harmony as is admitted, by even the most virulent opponents [1] of the original integrity of the Iliad, to pervade almost every page of that extraordinary poem.

In adopting any general principle for judging literary works by internal evidence, an important previous question occurs: whether the same rules are to be followed in regard to the Iliad and Odyssey, as would apply to poems of similar character in historical times. This question, when proposed in the abstract, can admit of but one answer: that the text of Homer must be tried by the same touchstone as that of Virgil, or Milton; or if indulgence be afforded, it ought to be to the poet of an age least provided with mechanical aids to accurate composition. Certain it is however that this simple rule of equity has, throughout the whole recent course of Homeric research, been systematically reversed; and that, were the same rigorous tests of uniformity, so mercilessly enforced in regard to Homer, to be transferred to his more civilised successors, different portions of the Æneid or Paradise Lost might, upon still more valid grounds, be assigned to different authors. Any such attempt would undoubtedly awaken, even in many of those who in Homer's case have been most zealous in the work of destruction, feelings of unmixed reprobation or ridicule.[2] It is the obscurity alone in which the origin of the

[1] Herm. Opusc. vol. VI. p. 72.

[2] Bentley's edition of the Paradise Lost supplies an example of a singularly pointed nature.

Greek poems is involved that affords a shield behind which the real hypercriticism of such attacks shelters itself. But is it not obvious that, by the admission of any such *external* influence on the judgement, the whole principle of *internal* evidence is corrupted in its source? The thing to be proved can never be made an element of the proof. No critic, then, can honestly grapple with this analysis, who is not prepared to extend the same criteria enforced in Homer's case to every other work or author.

The remarks offered in a former page on the early vicissitudes of the poems will obviate any impression that, in advocating the substantial correctness of the old opinion, it is proposed to maintain the absolute integrity of their text as it now exists. The circumstances under which they were transmitted render it next to impossible but that their original purity should have suffered. In some, perhaps the greater number of cases, the tampering may have been so managed as to be no longer discernible; in others the existing anomalies may afford reasonable ground of suspicion, and, where supported by traditional authority, of conviction. But even in these latter cases the impartial critic, instead of condemning, on account of trivial blemishes, a substantial well-proportioned edifice as a patchwork of different times and architects, will rather avail himself of its general solidity and elegance as a criterion for distinguishing the injudicious alterations or repairs to which it may have been subjected.

Similarity and discrepancy of style. Their relative value as

4. It may be laid down as a general rule, in all questions as to the genuine character of a great literary work, that the evidence supplied by similarity of style is stronger on the one side, than that

sources of internal evidence.

derived from a corresponding amount of anomaly on the other. As long as human nature is imperfect, the efforts of human art will be unequal. The same poet can as little be expected to maintain unvarying consistency and propriety, as the same man uninterrupted health of body or serenity of mind. It must further be remembered that original genius is proverbially eccentric and capricious, and that these characteristics are more especially apt to find place in the compositions of a poet unshackled by the critical refinements of civilised ages. The same freedom of fancy which raises him to the highest regions of the sublime, will at times lead him into defects at which an ordinary versifier of the present day might be entitled to cavil. Such occasional blemishes appear also in a more striking light, from the contrast with the excellences on which they are engrafted. The truth of this remark is borne out by the case, not only of Homer, but of every poet of similar genius flourishing under parallel circumstances. Let Dante or Shakspeare be submitted to the same ordeal by which Homer has been tested, and it is certain that from their standard works might be selected numerous passages, or even integral parts, which, if collated with the nobler specimens of their style, would as amply deserve expunction as any line, text, or book, of either Iliad or Odyssey. Still less attention is due to the arguments derived from occasional discrepancies of fact or of geographical and mythological allusion. Such anomalies, as will be abundantly shown in the sequel, are not only observable, and to a far greater extent, in the text of the most accomplished successors of Homer, but would even seem, from the similarity in the

mode of their occurrence, to be inseparable from the free and genial treatment of any prolonged series of mythical adventures.[1]

Very different is the value of the affirmative evidence, resulting from a large amount of correspondence, in any such case. Writers of ordinary capacity, whose style is formed on the prevailing taste of the day, may frequently present so great a general resemblance, as to render it difficult to decide upon internal grounds to whom, among those of a given period, a production is to be ascribed: but any such pervading identity between any two or more different minds, in respect to all the higher excellences, as well as the more delicate characteristics, of poetical genius, as it would be necessary to assume on the basis of the modern Homeric theory, were a phenomenon unexampled in historical times, nor consequently admissible on hypothetical grounds in the darker periods of art. Throughout the two poems the same deep knowledge of human nature is displayed, in identically the same forms, not merely in the delineation of those more prominent passions or feelings which may sometimes be vigorously apprehended even by inferior artists, but in the penetrating power with which the single great master dives into the recesses of the heart, plucks forth its hidden treasures, and embodies them in living forms before our eyes. Throughout, the same spirit and originality in the conception of his characters are combined with the same constancy in

[1] This rule is not only admitted, but pointedly enforced by Hermann, in theory, and against others, in the course of the same commentaries where it is so completely contemned and violated by himself. Opp. Misc. vol. VI. p. 80. et alibi.

sustaining them; the same vivid impression of the varied phenomena of nature, with the same graphic powers of description, perspicuity of narrative, and harmony of numbers. Were therefore the authorship of the poems, over which these excellences are so copiously spread, to be parcelled out as has been proposed, the dark ages of Greece would present the phenomenon, not merely of one, but of a legion of heroic bards, equalling or surpassing the greatest of which any other age or country can boast. With this improbability would be combined the little less marvellous circumstance, that these transcendantly gifted minstrels, amid the variety of materials which tradition placed at their disposal, should have conspired in selecting the Troïc series of adventures, or even two limited portions of it, while the crowd of second-rate poets were equally unanimous in preferring different subjects, or different portions of the same. To the above coincidences need scarcely be added, as regards the more popular form of the modern theory, the still more marvellous coincidence, that these poems, after several centuries of circulation in their separate capacity, should have been found to constitute the parts of two vast integral epopees, each following out a continuous train of events through numerous complicated vicissitudes: that one part should have suggested itself as a beginning, another as a middle, a third as an end; that the rest should have afforded appropriate episodes; and that each should have been interspersed with mutual references to the incidents destined by the presiding genius of Parnassus to go before and follow after: that one should have contained a prophecy of events to be carried into effect in the sequel, and in due

time as punctually fulfilled in another, with, perhaps, an equally pointed reference to the prediction : that each should have taken up in its turn the same series of actors, in the persons not only of the more prominent heroes, but of the subordinate, and, for the most part, purely fictitious characters, heralds, charioteers, goatherds, waiting-maids, even warriors of remote Asiatic regions, whose epic importance consists mainly in their sonorous names; pure Greek names, in many cases, assigned to Paphlagonian or Halizonian barbarians, and which it is incredible could be the simultaneous invention of each poet for the occasion.

Consistency in the poet's portraiture of character.

5. It is probable that, like most other great painters of human nature, Homer was indebted to previous tradition for the original sketches of his principal heroes. These sketches, however, could have been little more than outlines which, as worked up into the finished portraits of the Iliad and Odyssey, must rank as his own genuine productions. In every branch of imitative art, this faculty of representing to the life the moral phenomena of our nature in their varied phases of virtue, vice, weakness, or eccentricity, is the highest and rarest attribute of genius; and rarest of all as exercised by Homer through the medium of dramatic action, where the characters are never formally described, but made to develope themselves by their own language and conduct. It is this, among his many great qualities, which chiefly raises Homer above all other poets of his own class; nor, with the single exception perhaps of the great English dramatist, has any poet ever produced so numerous and spirited a variety of original characters, of different ages, ranks, and sexes. Still more peculiar to himself

than their variety is the unity of thought, feeling, and expression, often of minute phraseology, with which they are individually sustained, and yet without an appearance of effort on the part of their author. Each describes himself spontaneously, when brought on the scene; just as the automata of Vulcan in the Odyssey, though indebted to the divine artist for the mechanism on which they move, appear to perform their functions by their own unaided powers. That any two or more poets should simultaneously have conceived such a character as Achilles is next to impossible. Still less credible is it, that the different parts of the Iliad, where the hero successively appears as the same sublime ideal being, under the influence of the same combination of virtues, failings, and passions, thinking, speaking, acting, and suffering, according to the same single type of heroic grandeur, can be the production of more than a single mind. Such evidence is perhaps even stronger in the case of the less prominent actors, in so far as it is still less possible that different artists should simultaneously agree in their portraits of mere subordinate incidental personages, than of heroes whose renown may have rendered their characters a species of public property. Two poets of the Elizabethan age might, without any concert, have harmonised to a great extent in their portrait of Henry V.; but that the correspondence should have extended to the imaginary companions of his youth, the Falstaffs, Pistols, Bardolphs, Quicklys, were incredible. But the nicest shades of peculiarity in the inferior actors of the Iliad and Odyssey are conceived and maintained in the same spirit of distinction as in Achilles or Hector. Even where there exists some

bond of connexion, ethic or historical, between the destinies of certain pairs of heroes, as of Achilles and Patroclus, Hector and Paris, Agamemnon and Menelaus, the poet has, with the most subtle though palpable design, availed himself of this contingency, as will hereafter be demonstrated, in adapting or contrasting as it may be, the relations of the one to the other, so as to give more effectual relief to the distinctive peculiarities of each.[1]

State of society which produced the poems.

6. The most comprehensive, and perhaps upon the whole, most plausible, objection, on the ground of internal evidence, to the popular view, is the improbability that, in "so rude an age," any poet should have conceived so vast and complicated a scheme of epic action as the Iliad or Odyssey; or that two such works, even if executed, could have been preserved entire to posterity. In order rightly to appreciate this difficulty, attention must be recalled to a distinction, already noticed, between the earlier and more advanced stages of the poetical art. The rules laid down by the standard antient critics cannot, unless in rare and partial instances, be considered as their own invention. The critical office consists in eliciting and reducing to system, from the original works of genius, those laws, to the intuitive observance of which the authors of the works owe their fame and popularity. That, without the ex-

[1] It is somewhat remarkable that the above internal evidences have rarely been more eloquently or convincingly summed up than by Wolf himself (Præf. ad Il. p. xxii.), who admits that, but for the force of the historical proofs on the other side, they would be irresistible. It is not too much to assert, that, had Wolf survived the subsequent stages of the controversy which bears his name, he would have subscribed to the now unanimous admission of critics of all classes, that the internal evidence is the only valid basis on which the question can be treated. Wolf may, therefore, in so far, fairly be adduced as a witness against his own cause.

ample of such original models, the ingenuity of speculative bookmaking should have devised any abstract norm of theoretical perfection for the higher branches of poetry, is repugnant to all experience. This, however, is the anomaly which the objection above stated presupposes in the case of epic composition, where it is perhaps more especially unlikely to have found place. Nor must it be overlooked that, whatever sceptical doubts may have been entertained as to an original unity of the whole design, the elegance of detail by which the parts are adorned has never been denied to be the genuine offspring of the old heroic minstrelsy. Here, again, is an obvious reversal of what reason and experience teach in such cases. While elegance of detail is the proper characteristic of an advanced stage of art, magnitude of design is that of its earlier epochs in every country. If the semibarbarous age of Greece could produce a poet distinguished by all the individual elements of excellence, perspicuity of style, richness of imagery, harmony of numbers, and above all by purity and depth of moral sentiment, it could hardly have denied him the faculty of combining these elements into a comprehensive and symmetrical whole. The same principle extends to other branches of primeval art. How the stupendous masses of Tiryns or Stonehenge were conveyed and adjusted will ever remain wonderful to civilised posterity. We do not, however, insist on discovering in them the work of a colony of accomplished mathematicians; but were they arranged in graceful architectural forms, and adorned with finely executed sculptures, the latter inference would be unavoidable. Any theory therefore which, while it concedes the surpassing finish of detail in

the Iliad and Odyssey to the so-called barbarous age of their author, can only explain their vastness of design as an effort of the professional ingenuity of later times, is essentially paradoxical.

Admitting then the perfecting of epic art, the transition from legends of petty adventure to the completion of a great heroic poem, to be the office rather of inspired genius than of bookmaking artifice, it may further confidently be asserted, that the state of society most favourable to the development of such genius is precisely that pictured in the Iliad; that intermediate stage namely, equally removed from the extremes of barbarism and refinement, which, free from the artificial distinction of vulgarity and politeness, admits of contemporary objects, interwoven with personal feelings and sympathies, being made the subject of poetical description. In order rightly to judge on this point, it will be necessary to discard, or greatly qualify, the epithets "rude" and "barbarous," so frequently bestowed on the age of Homer, and test it by his own descriptions. We there find a race among whom civilisation was sufficiently matured to impart splendour to the social fabric, without impairing their own martial ferocity or simplicity of habits. In the upper class we perceive an order of patriarchal nobility, clothed in elegant garments; protected by highly wrought armour; inhabiting spacious mansions adorned with colonnades, gilding, statuary, and pleasure-gardens; delighting in music, poetry, and oratory; performing journeys in chariots, with an ease and rapidity scarcely conceivable in a country not intersected with made roads; and navigating in fifty-oar galleys, with a freedom equal or

superior to their descendants centuries afterwards. The population reside chiefly in towns, with the exception of those engaged in agriculture, which art is carried to a high state of perfection in all its leading branches as cultivated in later times, while many of the elementary trades and manufactures are exercised as distinct professions. Such is Homer's own picture of the social condition of his age, betraying certainly no such barbarism as to preclude the highest development of the epic faculty. A few generations later, it might with better reason be urged, that the change of manners would have interposed serious obstacles to the production of two such poems, by blunting the heroic enthusiasm of their author, and substituting the studied magniloquence of Æschylus or Pindar for the native simplicity and grandeur of Homer.

Antiquity of the Homeric epopee. Ilii-persis of Demodocus.

7. The fact that poets of ordinary talents, at a period not essentially different from that which produced the Iliad, had succeeded in embodying the same or a similar series of events in long narratives, is established by the existence of those other primitive works, Thebaïs, Cypria, Ilii-persis, and others, the genuine integrity of which has never been seriously impugned. It were surely a strange distinction to allow to an inferior genius of the ante-Olympic era the capacity of inditing a long epopee of inferior merit, and yet deny to a genius of surpassing excellence the ability to compose one of just and happy proportions.[1] But, in fact, the descriptions given

[1] This consideration also meets the objection, to which some might attach importance, derived from the want or imperfection of the art of writing, as offering a bar either to the composition or preservation of such voluminous poems in their existing integrity. If a Cypria could

in the Odyssey, of the poems recited by the minstrels who figure in its action, afford conclusive evidence that works of a similarly extensive character were familiar to its author. Attention may, in particular, be directed to that recited by the Phæacian bard Demodocus, under the title of Hippocosmos, or the "Stratagem of the Horse." The narrative of this poem, according to the poet's own epitome of its contents[1] as here subjoined, must have comprised the whole series of events from the fabric of the fatal image down to the sack of the city and recovery of Helen, as actually treated by Homer's Cyclic successors in the works entitled Ilii-persis, or Destruction of Troy.[2]

"After the usual proœmium invoking the divine aid, the scene opens in the quarters of the Greeks, who are described as setting fire to their camp and sailing from the coast, in order to delude the Trojans into the belief of their having finally abandoned the siege, leaving the wooden horse as an atoning gift to the protecting gods of the city. We are then transported to Troy, where the colossal image, manned by the bravest of the Greeks, is found already lodged in the agora, and the inhabitants are engaged in warm debate as to its disposal. Some, suspecting treachery, were for opening the planks to ascertain its contents; others for throwing it at once over the cliffs of the citadel. A third party asserted the sincerity of the offering, and the propriety of its dedication in the temple of the goddess. The latter opinion prevails, through a decree of destiny that the city should fall as soon as the wooden horse was admitted within its ramparts. The final success of the stratagem is then described; the issue of the warriors from their ambush, and their exploits in different quarters of the city. The brunt of the struggle is concentrated round the dwelling of Helen

be handed down from the eighth century B.C., an Iliad might, from a few generations earlier. The full examination of this point, however, belongs to the early history and progress of the art of writing itself. Infra, B. III. Ch. vii.

[1] Odyss. θ. 492.

[2] Infra, Ch. xix. § 10.

and Deïphobus, under the conduct of Menelaus and Ulysses, who, supported by Minerva, finally secure the complete victory of the Greeks."

The artistic epic arrangement of this poem appears from a collation of its title with its contents. The "Hippocosmos," literally, Preparation or Outfit of the Horse, ought historically speaking to form the introductory scene. But the poem opens with the subsequent operations of the Greek armament; nor is there a word of the horse itself until, on the scene shifting to Troy, it is found already within the walls. Here then was the proper place for the description of the actual Hippocosmos, the fabric and equipment of the horse, with the list of heroes it contained, as a retrospective episode. Besides this subsidiary narrative, the epitome alludes to other heads of matter sufficient to swell the poem out to a bulk little short of an Iliad or Odyssey. For example, the two verses,

514. ἤειδεν δ᾽ ὡς ἄστυ διέπραθον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
ἱππόθεν ἐκχύμενοι, κοῖλον λόχον ἐκπρολιπόντες,

comprehend the return of the fleet from its ambush on the neighbouring coasts, the secret march of the Greeks to the city, the issue of their comrades from the horse, occupation of the gates, and admission of the main body. What a copious mass of epic materials is also suggested by the line

516. ἄλλον δ᾽ ἄλλῃ ἄειδε πόλιν κεραϊζέμεν αἰπήν,

indicating the separate adventures of Neoptolemus, the lesser Ajax, and others so celebrated in the Cyclic accounts of the catastrophe. More specific mention is made of the assault on the abode of Helen,

whose capture forms an appropriate close to the poem and the vicissitudes of the war.

Subdivision of the following analysis.

8. The properties of every such poem as the Iliad or Odyssey may, as objects of analytical criticism, be classed under three heads: the plan and conduct of the action; the conception and portraiture of character; and those features of detail in language, sentiment, or imagery which, amid the poverty of our critical vocabulary, fall to be comprised under the general denomination of Style. In regard to the first two heads, the analysis of each poem will here require to be taken separately. The third head will embrace both poems simultaneously; the evidence of parallel passages, and of correspondence in language, sentiment, and imagery, bearing no less immediately on the question of unity of origin in the two poems than in the separate parts of each. There is however one important element of epic composition, its divine or supernatural mechanism, which, while also common to both poems, can hardly with propriety be included under any one of these heads. The direct agency of the gods on human affairs, by constituting them in some degree leading characters of each work, might seem indeed to entitle them to a place under the second head. That agency, however, also comprehends an essential portion of the figurative imagery of the poems, involving questions altogether foreign to the mere human department of their action. It will, therefore, be more appropriately ranked under a separate head of Divine mechanism.

CHAP. V.

HOMER. ILIAD. CONCORDANCE OF THE TEXT.

1. ANALYTICAL EPITOME OF THE TEXT.—2. "ARISTEA OF DIOMED."—3. SECESSION OF ACHILLES. CONSTRUCTION OF THE RAMPART. INTERDICT OF JUPITER.—4. FIRST AND LAST BOOKS. PARALLEL OF.—5. SECOND BOOK. CATALOGUE.—6. TENTH BOOK, OR DOLONEA.

Analytical epitome of the text.

1. BEFORE turning our attention to the higher features of poetical or moral design in the action of the Iliad, it will be proper to consider how far even the purely mechanical structure of the text is compatible with the operations of more than a single workman. The subjoined epitome has, accordingly, been drawn up with the view of placing in a more distinct light the minuter links in the chain of connexion, and will hence, it need scarcely be added, be found to comprise matters of detail not usually thought worthy of a place in a similar compendium.

I.

The poet invokes the Muse to celebrate the anger of Achilles and its consequences, the reverses of the Greek arms, and slaughter of many heroes. Chryses, priest of Apollo, arrives in the camp for the purpose of ransoming his daughter Chryseïs, taken by Achilles in the sack of the neighbouring town of Thebes, and allotted to Agamemnon as his share of the spoil. The petition of Chryses is contemptuously rejected by Atrides; and Apollo, in revenge, sends a pestilence into the host. On the tenth day Achilles calls a council, when the augur Calchas, at his behest, expounds the cause of the divine wrath, and urges its propitiation by restoring Chryseïs to her father. Agamemnon accedes to this proposal, but declares his intention, to which he adheres in spite of a remonstrance from Nestor[1], of indemnifying himself for the

[1] 275.; conf. IX. 108.

loss of the damsel by appropriating Briseïs, the favourite mistress of Achilles. That hero, furious at the insult, is about to inflict summary vengeance on its author, when he is checked by Minerva, who assures him "that ere long his anger will be propitiated by an offer of gifts many times the value of what he is about to lose."[1] Achilles acquiesces, but resolves to abstain from all further part in the war, and foretells that the day is not far distant when Agamemnon, "witnessing the destruction of his host by the arms of Hector, will repent of his insolence to the best of his warriors." Chryseïs is sent back to her parents, and Briseïs is led off from the tent of Achilles to that of Agamemnon. Achilles supplicates his mother Thetis, to persuade Jupiter to avenge his wrongs by the discomfiture of the Greeks. He also describes the sack of Thebes, "the city of Ĕtion," in which Chryseïs was taken.[2] Thetis fulfils her son's request, on the return of Jupiter from Ethiopia twelve days afterwards.[3] Her prayer is granted, and confirmed by a nod of Jupiter's head[4], much against the will of Juno, a warm friend to the Greek cause.

II.

On the morrow Jove, mindful of his promise to Thetis, encourages Agamemnon in a dream[5] with an assurance of the speedy conquest of the city. In the ensuing council of war it is decided accordingly to march out to battle, after a long debate in which these events are described as taking place in the ninth year of the war.[6] Thersites reproaches Agamemnon with his treatment of Achilles. Nestor advises Agamemnon to marshal the troops according to their different tribes.[7] A catalogue is given of the armament, with a more succinct account of the Trojan forces, who advance to the combat. Two Hellenic chiefs, Protesilaus and Philoctetes, are described, the latter as absent on account of disease, the former as slain on the first landing of the army.[8] The secession of Achilles is alluded to, with its cause, Agamemnon's insulting treatment of him, in the seizure of his mistress Briseïs, the maid of Lyrnessus[9], captured by him in the sack of that city, when Thebes also was destroyed. An assurance is added of his being speedily restored to the battle. Two Mysian

[1] 213.; conf. IX. 120. XIX. 140. [2] 366.; conf. II. 691., VI. 415., IX. 328., XXIII. 826. [3] 493. sqq.; conf. 528., VIII. 370., XIII. 350., XV. 76. 598., XVIII. 74. [4] 528.; conf. XV. 75.

[5] 6.; conf. IX. 18. [6] 295. [7] 362. [8] 701.; conf. XV. 705., XIII. 681., XVI. 286. [9] 690. sq.; conf XX. 192., et locc. citt.

leaders, Chromis and the augur Ennomus[1], are described as among the warriors afterwards slain by Achilles in the river Scamander.

III.

On the advance of the two armies, Paris challenges Menelaus to single combat, on condition that Helen and her property shall be awarded to the victor. Priam is sent for to ratify the agreement. He is found sitting on the ramparts with Helen, of whom he inquires the names of the Greek heroes in the distance. Allusion is made by Antenor to the embassy of Menelaus and Ulysses to claim Helen, previous to the declaration of war by the Greeks.[2] Paris, defeated by Menelaus, is rescued by Venus, who conveys him to Helen's apartments[3] in the city. Agamemnon claims the victory and stipulated prize for his brother.

IV.

Jupiter, in furtherance of his views relative to the future course of the war, dispatches Minerva to prevent the fulfilment of the treaty.[4] She persuades Pandarus, prince of Lycia, to shoot treacherously at Menelaus, who is slightly wounded[5], and the Trojans again advance to the attack. Agamemnon, in marshalling the host, reproves Diomed[6] for want of zeal, and bids him remember the valiant exploits of his father Tydeus[7], under the auspices of Minerva, in the war of Thebes. Mars takes the field as champion of the Trojans, Pallas of the Greeks.[8] The Trojans, giving way, are reminded by Apollo from their citadel, that Achilles no longer fights in the ranks of the enemy.[9] Piroüs, chief of the Thracians[10], is slain.

V.

Diomed under the patronage of Minerva signalises himself. Minerva persuades Mars to retire from the battle.[11] Diomed, wounded by an arrow of Pandarus, is healed by his patroness, who orders him to avoid collision with the other deities, but to attack Venus should she interfere. Pandarus, expressing mortification at the failure of his shots at Menelaus and Diomed[12], mounts the chariot of Æneas, and in a joint assault on Diomed is slain.

[1] 859.; conf. xxi. 7., xvii. 218.

[2] 203. sqq.; conf. vii. 347. sqq., xi. 125. 138. sqq. [3] 382.; conf. vi. 321.

[4] 68. sqq.; conf. vii. 69. 347. sqq. [5] 127.; conf. v. 206. [6] 370.; conf. ix. 34. [7] 372.; conf. v. 800. x. 285. [8] 439.; conf. v. 30. [9] 512.; conf. v. 788., vi. 99., vii. 229., ix. 352.; xiii. 100. sq., xiv. 366., xv. 721., xviii. 257., xx. 26. [10] 527.; conf. ii. 844., vi. 7., x. 434.

[11] 30.; conf. iv. 439. [12] 206.; conf. iv. 127.

Æneas is rescued by Apollo, but Diomed obtains possession of his horses.[1] Mars joins Hector in a charge on the Greeks. Diomed, observing the approach of the god, advises his countrymen to retreat. Minerva reproaches him with pusillanimity, reminding him that, when Achilles fought in the Greek ranks[2], the Trojans ventured not so much as to quit the walls of their city, and taunts him with inferiority to his father Tydeus[3] her former favourite, whose exploits in the Theban war she contrasts with his own present backwardness. Diomed justifies his conduct, as in compliance with her injunctions not to oppose the gods. Commending his obedience, she takes her place by his side in his chariot, and by a thrust of the hero's spear[4] Mars is disabled and flies.

VI.

Acamas, the remaining Thracian chief[5], is slain by Ajax. Helenus the Trojan augur sends Hector to the city to propitiate Minerva, that she may restrain the valour of Diomed, which he considers "no less formidable than that of Achilles had formerly been."[6] Diomed and Glaucus, in a friendly dialogue, agree to avoid hostile collision during the remainder of the war. Hector arrives at Troy, and after performing his commission visits Paris, whom he finds still in Helen's apartment.[7] Andromache implores Hector to moderate his valour, reminding him of her family afflictions, consequent on the destruction by Achilles of her native city Thebes.[8] Hector returns to the field accompanied by Paris.

VII.

The havoc committed by the two Trojan chiefs on rejoining the battle, induces Minerva to accept Apollo's proposal of a single combat between Hector and one of the Greek heroes. Hector accordingly challenges the best among them, apologising at the same time for the violation of the late treaty, on the plea of its having been so ordained by Jupiter.[9] The lot falls upon Ajax, who boasts that "Hector will find the Greek camp contains other notable warriors besides the deserter Achilles."[10] The combatants are separated by nightfall. In the Trojan council, Antenor recommends the restoration of Helen, in fulfilment[11] of the

[1] 263. 323.; conf. VIII. 108., XXIII. 291. [2] 788.; conf. IV. 512., et locc. citt. [3] 800.; conf. IV. 372., X. 285. [4] 855.; conf. XXI. 396. [5] 7.; conf. IV. 527., II. 844., X. 434. [6] 99.; conf. IV. 512., et locc. citt. [7] 321.; conf. III. 382. [8] 415.; conf. I. 366., et locc. citt. [9] 69.; conf. IV. 68. [10] 229.; conf. IV. 512., et locc. citt. [11] 347. sqq.; conf. III. 203., IV. 68., XI. 125. 138. sqq.

late treaty, auguring nothing but disaster in a cause where they fight under perjured vows. Paris refuses to part with his mistress. A day's truce is agreed on for the burial of the slain. The Greeks construct a rampart for the protection of the camp; but, owing to the just inaugural rites having been neglected, the gods decree the destruction of the work at the close of the war.[1] Euneüs, king of Lemnos[2], sends a present of a thousand measures of wine to Agamemnon.

VIII.

The next morning Jove issues an order[3] to the deities to abstain from all part in the action, which he views seated on Mount Ida, and turns the tide of success against the Greeks. Nestor is saved by Diomed, through the fleetness of the horses he had captured from Æneas.[4] The Greeks, driven back on their camp, are rallied by Agamemnon from the deck of the ship of Ulysses in the centre of the line, the extremities of which are flanked by the ships of Achilles and Ajax.[5] Neptune, pressed by Juno to succour the Greeks, refuses to disobey the order of Jove.[6] Juno and Pallas complain bitterly of Jupiter for yielding to the prayers of Thetis[7] on behalf of Achilles, and determine, in the face of the divine order, to proceed to the field. They are however deterred by a threatening message from Jupiter[8], who then returns from Ida to Olympus.[9] He there announces his intention of reducing the Greeks to still greater straits the next day, until the death of Patroclus shall restore Achilles to their ranks.[10] Darkness interrupts the assault of the Trojans on the camp. Hector takes up his quarters on the plain, kindling watch-fires[11], and bent on renewing the attack next morning.

IX.

Agamemnon, in despair at this reverse of fortune, complains of the deceit practised on him by Jupiter[12], and proposes in council to embark for Greece during the night. Diomed reprobates his pusillanimity, and contrasts it with his former boldness, when reproving himself[13] for a merely apparent tardiness for the combat.

[1] 450.; conf. XII. 6. [2] 467.; conf. IX. 72., XXI. 41., XXIII. 747. [3] 5. 47.; conf. 210. 352—397., XI. 74., XIII. 8. 524., XIV. 135. 160. sqq. XV. 128. sqq., XX. 23. [4] 108.; conf. V. 263. 323., XXIII. 291. [5] 223.; conf. X. 113., XI. 5., XIII. 681., II. 701. [6] 210.; conf. 5. supra. [7] 370.; conf. I. 493. sqq., et locc. citt. [8] 352—397.; conf. 5. supra, et locc. citt. [9] 439.; conf. XI. 182. [10] 470.; conf. XVI—XVIII. [11] 509.; conf. X. 12., XI. 56., XX. 3.

[12] 18.; conf. II. 6. sqq. [13] 34.; conf. IV. 370.

Nestor enjoins the posting of a guard[1] round the rampart, and that Agamemnon should entertain the chiefs in his quarters, now well supplied with wine recently arrived from Thrace.[2] At supper he reminds Agamemnon how unwisely his former remonstrance[3] against exasperating Achilles had been slighted, and counsels him to appease the hero's wrath. Atrides consents to restore Briseïs, adding other precious gifts.[4] Ulysses, Ajax, and Phœnix are sent as a deputation to Achilles, who spurns all offers of conciliation. Scornfully contrasting Agamemnon's present humility with his late overbearing conduct, he ridicules their attempt to defend the host by a rampart, as a substitute for *his* valour. He reminds them that, while he fought, the Trojans dare not venture beyond their walls[5]; and declares that he will not raise an arm for the relief, until Hector shall approach his own tents, ravaging the ships with fire and sword.[6] On the return of the mission the chiefs retire to rest.

X.

Agamemnon, harassed by the view of the Trojan fires[7] on the plain and by his gloomy prospects for the morrow, rises from his couch and rouses Nestor and Menelaus, who console him with the hope that Achilles may yet relent in time to restore their fortunes. The other chiefs are awakened in order to visit the guard[8], Diomed being dispatched for Ajax at his quarters in the extremity of the line.[9] Diomed and Ulysses, during the night, explore the Trojan position. The former hero supplicates Pallas to continue to him the favour vouchsafed of old to his father Tydeus in the Theban war.[10] Seizing and killing Dolon, a spy of Hector, on their way, they penetrate the hostile lines, slay Rhesus a Thracian chief newly arrived[11], and lead off his horses and chariot to the Greek camp.

XI.

In the morning the Goddess of discord, by Jove's orders, standing on the ship of Ulysses in the centre of the line, excites the army to action from the flank of Ajax to that of Achilles.[12] Agamemnon marshals his troops outside of the ditch. Hector advances from his quarters on the crown of the plain.[13] Discord,

[1] 66.; conf. x. 97. 180. sqq. [2] 72.; conf. vii. 467., et locc. citt. [3] 108.; conf. i. 275. [4] 120.; conf. i. 213., xix. 140. [5] 352.; conf. iv. 512., et locc. citt. [6] 650.; conf. xvi. 61.

[7] 12.; conf. viii. 509., et locc. citt. [8] 97. 180.; conf. ix. 66. [9] 113.; conf. viii. 223., et locc. citt. [10] 285.; conf. iv. 372., et locc. citt. [11] 434.; conf iv. 527., et locc. citt.

[12] 5.; conf. viii. 223., et locc. citt. [13] 56.; conf. xx. 3., viii. 509., et locc. citt.

alone among the deities, is now present, the rest being restrained by the decree of Jove[1], who again takes up his post on Mount Ida.[2] Agamemnon kills two sons of Antimachus, the Trojan elder who had proposed in the council of Priam to murder Menelaus and Ulysses on their embassy[3] to reclaim Helen. Soon after, wounded[4] himself in the hand by Coon son of Antenor, Atrides retires from the field, after killing Coon. Diomed also withdraws, wounded in the heel by an arrow of Paris.[5] Ulysses[6], Machaon the physician[7] and his brother Eurypylus[8] are also disabled by wounds and retire. Machaon is driven to the camp by Nestor, who entertains him with wine in his tent.[9] Achilles, observing the chariot pass, sends Patroclus to inquire the name of the wounded hero, "a message pregnant with future evil to Patroclus." Nestor informs Patroclus of the wounds of Agamemnon, Diomed, and Ulysses[10], and implores him to intercede with Achilles, either to come to the rescue, or to send the Myrmidon host under his own command.[11] On his way back to the tent of Achilles, Patroclus meets Eurypylus led off the field, and, accompanying him to his tent, assists in dressing his wound.[12]

XII.

While Patroclus tends the wounded Eurypylus[13], the Greeks are driven to their entrenchments, the future destruction of which[14], formerly threatened by Apollo and Neptune, is now distinctly foretold. Hector, by advice of Polydamas the seer,

[1] 74.; conf. VIII. 5., et locc. citt. [2] 182.; conf. VIII. 439. It is amusing to observe the blunders into which the more unscrupulous disciples of Wolf are occasionally led by their zeal to detect the blunders of Homer. One of the arguments urged by Hermann (Op. Misc. vol. v. p. 64.) in favour of his proposal to assign to a separate poet the whole text from v. 47. of B. VIII. to the end of B. XII., is the *perversity*, as he describes it, of the existing arrangement, where Jupiter, after having at v. 439. of B. VIII. returned from Ida to Olympus, is suddenly, and without further notice, at the opening of B. XIII., found again seated on the top of the former mountain. Is not the perversity rather on the part of the critic, who has overlooked this passage of B. XI.? [3] 125. 138.; conf. III. 203., et locc. citt. [4] 252.; conf. XIX. 53., XIV. 28., XVI. 26. [5] 399.; conf. 376., XIV. 28., XVI. 25. [6] 434. 487.; conf. XIV. 28., XVI. 26. [7] 506.; conf. XIV. 6. [8] 583.; conf. XVI. 27., XII. 1., et locc. citt. [9] 517. 598. 650.; conf. XIV. 1. [10] 660. sqq.; conf. XIV. 28., et locc. citt. [11] 796.; conf. XVI. 38., XV. 64. [12] 809.; conf. XII. 1., XV. 392., XVI. 27.
[13] 1.; conf. XI. 583. 809., XVI. 25., et locc. citt. [14] 6.; conf. VII. 450.

causes his troops to dismount and attack on foot. Asius alone, with his chariot, clears the ditch, "which he was never to recross alive, being destined to perish in it by the hand of Idomeneus."[1] Hector succeeds in forcing one of the gates. Glaucus is slightly wounded by an arrow of Teucrus.[2]

XIII.

Jupiter, still seated on Mount Ida, "not suspecting that after his prohibition[3] any deity will venture to take part in the fight," turns his attention to another quarter of the earth. Neptune avails himself of this opportunity[4], in the disguise of Calchas, to rally the Greeks, disheartened by the loss of so many of their heroes, and deprived, through Agamemnon's ill-judged rashness, of the services of their best champion. Jupiter, on the other hand, continues his favour to the Trojans, "in fulfilment of his promise to Thetis."[5] Idomeneus signalises himself, killing Asius[6], with other Trojan heroes. Deiphobus kills Ascalaphus a son of Mars, without the knowledge of that deity, restrained by Jove's command[7] from the battle. Hector directs the assault on the Greek lines in front of the ship of Protesilaus[8], their weakest point.

XIV.

Nestor, still sitting drinking in his tent with Machaon[9], while that hero's wound is dressed[10], hearing the tumult increase, goes

[1] 113.; conf. XIII. 387. [2] 387.; conf. XVI. 510.

[3] 8.; conf. VIII. 5., et locc. citt. [4] 10.; conf. XIV. 135., XV. 14. 158. [5] 350.; conf. I. 493., et locc. citt. [6] 387.; conf. XII. 113. [7] 518.; conf. XV. 112. 128., VIII. 5., et locc. citt. [8] 681.; conf. II. 701., et locc. citt., VIII. 223., et locc. citt.

[9] 1.; conf. XI. 517. 598. 650. [10] 6.; conf. XI. 506. Here may be observed another blunder of that merciless castigator of Homeric blunders, Hermann. Among his arguments (Opp. Miscell. vol. v. p. 60.) against the genuine character of this book, is the absence of all allusion to the wound of Machaon (inflicted in XI. 506.) in this passage, of which that wound forms the principal subject.

One more example may be subjoined of the imperfect knowledge of the poet's text upon which this writer's formidable system of scepticism is based. Among his arguments (op. cit. p. 66.) in favour of the "singulum carmen" supposed to be encased in the thirteenth book (v. 344—674.) is the occurrence in those 330 lines alone, among the portions of the text devoted to military matters, of exulting addresses by victorious heroes to their fallen enemies. The value of this remark may be tested by a reference to the following eleven parallel passages, three of which are in the immediate sequel of this same engagement: XIV. 453. 469. 478., XVI. 744. 829., XX. 388., XXI. 121. 183., XI. 362. 379. 449.

forth to reconnoitre. He meets the three disabled heroes[1], Agamemnon, Diomed, and Ulysses, the former of whom chides the old warrior for leaving the field, expressing his alarm lest other heroes should, like Achilles, have taken offence at him. Neptune consoles him, condemning the conduct of Achilles.[2] Juno, by aid of Venus, lulls Jupiter to sleep on Mount Ida, fearing lest his attention should be recalled to the affairs of Troy, and to the interference of Neptune.[3] Neptune assures the Greeks that Hector's boldness, caused solely by his knowledge of the absence of Achilles[4], might be checked by a vigorous display of valour. Hector, stunned by a blow of Ajax[5], is carried to the rear. Menelaus slays Hyperenor.[6]

XV.

The Greeks repulse the Trojans from the lines. Jupiter, awakening on Mount Ida, reproaches Juno with her treachery[7], and orders Neptune off the field.[8] He then pronounces the decree of Fate: "that the Greeks shall be routed until danger threatens the quarters of Achilles, who will then send Patroclus into action.[9] After slaying Sarpedon[10], Patroclus will himself fall by the hand of Hector.[11] Achilles will then arise and avenge his friend's death on the Trojan chief[12]; and henceforward fortune will favour the Greeks. But no relief can be granted until the wrath of Achilles be satiated, as promised to Thetis, and confirmed by a nod of the divine head."[13] Mars, informed of the death[14] of his son Ascalaphus, arms for vengeance, but is restrained by Minerva from his threatened act of disobedience.[15] Jupiter then dispatches Apollo to restore the disabled Hector[16], and complete the rout of the Greeks suspended by the interference of Neptune. They are again driven back with great loss to their lines. Patroclus, alarmed for the safety of the camp, returns from the tent of Eurypylus[17] to that of Achilles, for the purpose of again imploring him to relent. The Trojans surmount the rampart; and Hector, seizing the ship

[1] 28.; conf. xi. 252. 399. 434. 487., xvi. 25., xix. 48. sqq. [2] 135.; conf. xiii. 10., xv. 14. 158. [3] 160. sqq.; conf. xv. 4., xiii. 8., viii. 5., et locc. citt. [4] 366.; conf. iv. 512., et locc. citt. [5] 409.; conf. xv. 220. 239. 249. [6] 516.; conf. xvii. 24.

[7] 4.; conf. xiv. 160. sq., et locc. citt. [8] 14. 41. 158.; conf. xiii. 10., xiv. 135. sqq. [9] 64.; conf. xvi. 38. 126., xi. 796. [10] 67.; conf. xvi. 490. [11] 65.; conf. xvi. 818. [12] 68.; conf. xxii. 344. [13] 75, 76.; conf. i. 493. 528., et locc. citt. [14] 112.; conf. xiii. 518., viii. 5., et locc. citt. [15] 128.; conf. viii. 5., et locc. citt. [16] 220. 239. 249.; conf. xiv. 409., xx. 443., xxii. 213. sq., xxiii. 188., xxiv. 18. [17] 392.; conf. xi. 809., xii. 1., xvi. 27.

"which had brought Protesilaus to Troy, but which never restored him to his native land,"[1] and rejoicing in the glorious change of the late timid line of Trojan tactics[2], orders his troops to advance with torches, and set fire to the fleet.

XVI.

Patroclus, following Nestor's advice, describes to Achilles the rout of the Greeks, the disablement of Agamemnon, Ulysses, Diomed, and Eurypylus[3], with the danger to which the camp is exposed, and begs permission to put on the hero's armour, and go forth with the Myrmidons to the relief.[4] Achilles, "although he had formerly resolved to afford no aid until his own quarters were assailed by the hostile[5] fire," consents, but enjoins Patroclus to abstain from distant pursuit, and return when he has delivered the camp. Observing the nearer approach of the flames, he becomes urgent himself with Patroclus and his men to arm and sally forth. Patroclus accordingly, equipped in the armour and mounting the chariot of Achilles, advances at the head of 2500 Myrmidons, fifty from each of the fifty ships[6] of the hero, to the burning vessel of Protesilaus[7], where the brunt of the battle still continued. The Trojans, mistaking Patroclus for Achilles, are seized with panic and repulsed. Sarpedon is slain by Patroclus.[8] Apollo is sent by Jupiter to rescue the body. Glaucus, though still suffering from the wound received from Teucrus in mounting the wall[9], gallantly defends the corpse of his brother. It is rescued by Apollo, after having been stripped of its arms by the Myrmidon troops.[10] Patroclus, in breach of the order of Achilles, pursuing the enemy towards the city, is stunned by a blow from Apollo[11], then stabbed by Euphorbus[12] son of Panthoüs, and finally dispatched by Hector[13], whose speedy death by the hand of Achilles[14] he prophesies with his last words. Automedon, the charioteer of Achilles, pursued by Hector, escapes with his equipage to the camp.[15]

XVII.

Menelaus signalises himself in defence of the body of Patroclus.

[1] 705.; conf. II. 701., et locc. citt. [2] 721.; conf. XVIII. 257., IV. 512. et locc. citt.

[3] 25–27.; conf. XI. 252. 399. 434. 583. 809., XII. 1., XIV. 28., et locc. citt. [4] 38.; conf. 126., XI. 796. XV. 64. [5] 61. sqq.; conf. IX. 650. [6] 168.; conf. II. 685. [7] 286.; conf. II. 701., et locc. citt. [8] 490.; conf. XV. 67. [9] 510.; conf. XII. 387. [10] 663.; conf. XXIII. 800. [11] 788.; conf. XVIII. 454., XIX. 413. [12] 807.; conf. XVII. 14. [13] 818.; conf. XV. 65. [14] 852.; conf. XXII. 344. [15] 864.; conf. XVII. 75.

Euphorbus boasts of his share in the death of that hero.[1] Menelaus, reminding him of the recent fate of his brother Hyperenor[2], slain by himself in the early part of the battle, attacks and kills him. Hector, recalled by Apollo from the pursuit of Automedon[3], arrays himself in the arms of Achilles, stripped from the body of Patroclus.[4] Jupiter pronounces that he shall not return alive in them to Troy. The divine[5] horses of Achilles bewail the death of Patroclus. Jupiter, having now willed a change in the destinies of the war[6], sends Pallas, in the likeness of Phœnix, to encourage the Greeks. Menelaus dispatches Antilochus to announce to Achilles the death of his friend. The Greeks obtain possession of the body.

XVIII.

Achilles is overwhelmed with grief at the intelligence. Thetis, alarmed by his cry of distress, rises from the ocean, and inquires what can so afflict him, now that Jove's promise[7] to avenge his wrongs has been fulfilled. She engages to procure him a new suit of armour from Vulcan, in the room of that he had lost.[8] Warned by Iris that the body of Patroclus is again in danger, he appears on the ramparts, and with his shout of war puts the Trojans to flight, when darkness terminates the action. Polydamas, the seer, proposes in the Trojan council that they should avoid pitched battles, now that Achilles is again in the field, and shut themselves up within their walls.[9] Hector scornfully rejects this advice.[10] Achilles delays the obsequies of Patroclus until he shall have slain Hector, and captured twelve noble Trojans[11] to sacrifice on the funeral pile of his friend. Thetis, in requesting new arms from Vulcan for her son, relates the vicissitudes of his lot, the insult of Agamemnon, the vain attempt at reconciliation, the permission obtained by Patroclus to aid the Greeks equipped in the arms of his chief, and his own death by the joint agency of Apollo and Hector.[12] Vulcan prepares a suit of armour, with a shield of five plies of metal.[13]

XIX.

On the following morning Thetis delivers the new suit of arms to her son, who convenes a general council of the army. It is

[1] 14.; conf. xvi. 807. [2] 24.; conf. xiv. 516. [3] 75.; conf. xvi. 864. [4] 194.; conf. xviii. 130.; xxii. 323. [5] 426. 444.; conf. xxiii. 277. 283., xix. 409. [6] 546.; conf. xv. 72.

[7] 74.; conf. i. 493., et locc. citt. [8] 130.; conf. xvii. 194., et locc. citt. [9] 257—286.; conf. iv. 512., et locc. citt. [10] 284.; conf. xxii. 100. [11] 336.; conf. xxi. 27., xxiii. 175. [12] 454.; conf. xvi. 788., et locc. citt. [13] 481.; conf. xx. 269.

attended by Agamemnon, though still suffering[1] from the wound received from Coon son of Antenor, and by the other disabled heroes, Ulysses and Diomed.[2] The reconciliation then takes place, unconditionally on the part of Achilles; but Agamemnon, restoring Briseïs the maid of Lyrnessus[3], confers on the hero all the gifts offered by Ulysses the day before.[4] Xanthus, the favourite horse of Achilles, prophesies[5] his master's death, through the same hostile agency of Apollo[6] which caused that of Patroclus.

XX.

Jupiter, assembling the deities, revokes his previous interdict[7] against their interference, "lest the Trojans, who had never yet made head against Achilles in the field[8], should, now that he is further embittered by the loss of his friend, be unable, without divine aid, even to defend the walls of their city." Æneas encounters Achilles, who reminds him of a former escape from death at his hand in the war of Lyrnessus.[9] The spear of the Dardanian chief can penetrate but two of the five plies[10] of the divine shield. He is rescued by Neptune, whose hatred to the line of Priam does not extend to that of Anchises. Achilles kills Polydorus, son of Priam.[11] Hector, engaging Achilles, is preserved from death by Apollo.[12]

XXI.

Achilles, driving the enemy into the river Scamander[13], captures twelve youths[14] for sacrifice to the manes of Patroclus. He then kills Lycaon[15], a son of Priam, full brother of Polydorus slain by him shortly before, and who had also some weeks previously been taken prisoner by him, and ransomed by Euneüs[16] of Lemnos. His next victim is Asteropæus, chief of the Pæonians, whom he spoils of his arms.[17] He is then himself assailed by the river god, but defended by Vulcan. Mars attacks Minerva, reproaching her

[1] 53.; conf. xi. 252., et locc. citt. [2] 48. sq.; conf. xiv. 28., et locc. citt. [3] 60. sqq.; conf. xx. 192., et locc. citt. [4] 140. 147.; conf. ix. 120. sqq., i. 213. [5] 409.; conf. xvii. 426., et locc. citt. [6] 413. sq.; conf. xvi. 788., xviii. 454.

[7] 23.; conf. viii. 5., et locc. citt. [8] 26.; conf. iv. 512., et locc. citt. [9] 192.; conf. 92., xix. 60., ii. 690—692., ix. 328. [10] 269.; conf. xviii. 481. [11] 407.; conf. xxi. 91. 35., et locc. citt. [12] 443.; conf. xv. 220. 239., et locc. citt.

[13] 7.; conf. ii. 859., et locc. citt. [14] 27.; conf. xviii. 336., xxiii. 175. [15] 35. 91.; conf. xx. 407., xxii. 46. [16] 41.; conf. vii. 467., et locc. citt. [17] 183.; conf. xxiii. 560.

with having formerly instigated Diomed to wound him.[1] He is again disabled and led off the field.

XXII.

Priam, from the wall, exhorts Hector to take refuge from Achilles within the gate, reminding him of the recent fate of his brothers Lycaon and Polydorus.[2] Hector remains, ashamed to quit the field, after his late boast to Polydamas[3] that he would single-handed defend the city against Achilles. Apollo, foreseeing the fatal hour of his favourite to be arrived, withdraws the protection hitherto vouchsafed him[4], and he is slain. Achilles, himself resplendent with the arms of Vulcan[5], strips his fallen enemy of those plundered from Patroclus[6], and drags the body to the camp at his chariot-wheels.

XXIII.

The day following, Achilles performs the obsequies of his friend, sacrificing on his funeral pile the twelve Trojan youths.[7] Apollo[8] preserves the body of Hector from corruption. On the morrow, Achilles celebrates the funeral games of Patroclus, but takes no part himself in the chariot race, owing to the grief of his immortal steeds[9] for the death of that hero. Diomed conquers with the horses taken from Æneas when their owner was preserved by Apollo.[10] Among the prizes distributed by Achilles are, the arms spoiled from Asteropæus[11]; a silver cup, received as the price of Lycaon, son of Priam, from Euneüs of Lemnos[12]; the arms stripped by Patroclus from Sarpedon[13]; and a ball of iron taken in the sack of Thebes.[14]

XXIV.

Achilles continues to drag the corpse of Hector daily round the tomb of Patroclus, while Apollo preserves it from decay.[15] Thetis, by order of Jupiter, exhorts Achilles to restore it if demanded. On the twelfth day Priam, warned by a message from Jupiter,

[1] 396.; conf. v. 855.

[2] 46.; conf. xxi. 35., et locc. citt. [3] 100.; conf. xviii. 284. [4] 213. 302. 344.; conf. xx. 443., xv. 220., et locc. citt. [5] 316.; conf. xviii. in fine. [6] 323.; conf. xvii. 194. et locc. citt.

[7] 175.; conf. xxi. 27., xviii. 336. [8] 188.; conf. xv. 220., et locc. citt. [9] 277. 283.; conf. xvii. 426. 444., xix. 409. [10] 291.; conf. v. 263. 323., viii. 108. [11] 560.; conf. xxi. 183. [12] 747.; conf. xxi. 41., vii. 467., et locc. citt. [13] 800.; conf. xvi. 663. [14] 826.; conf. i. 366., et locc. citt.

[15] 18.; conf. xxiii. 188., xv. 220., et locc. citt.

visits in person the tent of Achilles, and supplicates the restoration of the body. The request is granted. The old king, passing the night in the Myrmidon camp, returns next morning with his precious burthen to Troy, and after nine days' preparation performs the obsequies of his son.

Aristea of Diomed.

2. The extent and value of the above concordance in the mechanical structure of the poem[1] will be better appreciated, if traced in detail through one or more of those portions of the text to which, by sceptical commentators, appeal has chiefly been made as betraying a former independance of character.

Let us first examine the "rhapsody" called, in the old subdivision of the poem, the "Prowess of Diomed," comprising the fifth and sixth books according to the existing arrangement.[2]

I. The first line ushers the reader into the midst of a battle, without any notice of where or why it was fought, or who were the contending parties, by the announcement that "Pallas there urged Diomed into the thickest of the fight." Such an exordium plainly assumes, on the part of the poet's audience, a previous knowledge of a combat already commenced and interrupted. II. That this combat belonged to the few weeks of the Trojan war marked by the secession of Achilles is proved, not only by his absence from the field, but by several pointed allusions to its cause. III. The deities left in immediate charge of the interrupted action of the previous book were, Mars on the side of the Trojans, Minerva on that of the

[1] See Appendix C.

[2] The old limits of this canto have been differently fixed by different authorities. That of Herodotus (II. cxvi.), as the earliest, has here been preferred. The first part of B. VI. is also occasionally distinguished by its proper title of "Interview between Hector and Andromache;" but the action even there continues to hinge essentially on the "Prowess of Diomed."

Greeks. At the commencement of this book, accordingly, Minerva's first care is, by a stratagem, to procure Mars's retirement from the field, and a consequent freer scope for the exploits of her favourite hero. IV. The leading occurrence of the previous book is the violation of the truce between the two armies by the treacherous shot of Pandarus. To this outrage Pandarus himself alludes in the renewed action, expressing his modification at its only partial success; and his own death by the hand of Diomed forms an appropriate conclusion of his career. V. Diomed defeats Æneas, and obtains possession of his horses. This prize, with the circumstances attending its acquisition, is afterwards repeatedly noticed by the victor; first in the eighth book and again in the twenty-third. VI. Diomed successively wounds Venus and Mars. The latter achievement is referred to in the twenty-first book by the injured god himself. VII. Minerva reminds the Greeks that, "while Achilles fought in their ranks, the Trojans never ventured to advance beyond the gates of their city." This statement is confirmed by Achilles himself in the ninth book, and by other heroes in numerous parallel passages. VIII. Diomed and Glaucus, after their dialogue, agree to avoid hostile encounter during the remainder of the war, and the compact is carefully observed in the sequel. IX. Paris, who acts a prominent part in the preceding and subsequent engagements, does not appear in that now described, having in the third book, after his defeat by Menelaus, been carried off by Venus to repose in his wife's apartments. X. Accordingly Hector, on his visit to Troy to propitiate Minerva, finds him loitering in Helen's chamber, and orders

him back to the field. XI. Andromache describes Achilles as destroyer of her native city. This exploit is ascribed to the same hero in numerous other parts of the poem.

That these coincidences could be the result of chance is incredible; and it certainly requires a wide stretch of sceptical credulity to believe that Pisistratus, or any other primitive bookmaker, should have possessed either the inclination or the means of interlarding his disjointed stock of materials with such a series of mutual references. The same species of interconnexion might be exemplified throughout. It were, however, superfluous to follow up an operation which the reader may, if he think fit, by aid of the foregoing compendium perform quite as effectually for himself, and the results of which will occasionally be found curious, as well as convincing. Attention will here be confined to the few following general observations.

Secession of Achilles.

3. Let it be kept carefully in view, how far any part of the narrative could apply to any other period of the Trojan War than the few weeks signalised by the secession of Achilles. Let it be considered, more especially, whether any portion of the first eighteen books could be intelligible without his anger and absence from the field; or, of the remaining six, apart from his reconciliation with Agamemnon. Take, for example, the part of the third book (v. 121. to 244.) which bears with the antients the title of "View from the Walls." It happens that the more specific class of mutual references, which elsewhere form the chief mechanical bond of connexion, are there entirely wanting. One thing however is certain, that either the transactions there detailed

must have been from the first intended for an epoch of the war marked by the absence of Achilles, or else the author of this book must have been ignorant of any such hero having taken part in the siege; a somewhat extravagant alternative. Whoever, therefore, subdivides Homer's personality as has been proposed, must subscribe to the following singularly improbable assumptions: first, that all the more excellent poets who had selected the war of Troy as their subject had limited themselves, not only to the tenth year of the siege, but to the particular month of that year signalised by the quarrel between the chiefs; secondly, that more than three fourths of them had, in their choice of adventures, preferred those involving the defeat and disgrace of their countrymen; thirdly, that all the second-rate authors of the same primitive period, such as Arctinus, Stasinus, or Lesches, who treated of the same war, had as scrupulously confined themselves to its previous or subsequent stages. It is only by reference to the primary concentration of the whole Iliad around the destinies and influence of Achilles, that the above anomaly of its subject, the humiliation of the national arms during so large a portion of its action, can be explained. The cantos celebrating these disgraces and disasters are of the very essence of an entire Iliad; but the notion of a separate poem or ballad, of whatever length, exclusively devoted to such matter, having ever been composed by a popular Greek minstrel for a popular audience, seems altogether monstrous.[1]

[1] This, however, forms the essence of the whole theory of Hermann in his tract De Interpolationibus Homeri (Opusc. vol. v. p. 52.), and of Lachmann, in his Betrachtungen üb. die Ilias.

Construction of the rampart.

Another essential basis of mechanical unity in the poem is the construction of the rampart. This takes place in the seventh book. The reason ascribed for the glaring improbability that the Greeks should have left their camp and fleet unfortified during nine years, in the midst of a hostile country, is a purely poetical one: "So long as Achilles fought, the terror of his name sufficed to keep every foe at a distance." The disasters consequent on his secession first led to the necessity of other means of protection. Accordingly, in the battles previous to the eighth book, no allusion occurs to a rampart; in all those which follow it forms a prominent feature. Here then, in the anomaly as in the propriety of the Iliad, the destiny of Achilles, or rather this peculiar crisis of it, forms the pervading bond of connexion to the whole poem.

Jove's interdict against divine interference.

A similar bond of connexion in the military details of the narrative, is the decree issued by Jupiter, at the commencement of the eighth book, against any further interference of the gods in the battles. In the opening of the twentieth book this interdict is withdrawn. During the twelve intermediate books it is kept steadily in view. No interposition takes place but on the part of the specially authorised agents of Jove, or on that of one or two contumacious deities described as boldly setting his commands at defiance, but checked and reprimanded for their disobedience; while the other divine warriors, who in the previous and subsequent cantos are so active in support of their favourite heroes, repeatedly allude to the supreme edict as the cause of their present inactivity.[1]

[1] See the mutual references cited to v. 5. of B. VIII. Even the apparent exceptions do but confirm the rule. Hermann's attempt (De Interpol. Hom. p. 64.) to make out a case of discrepancy in the interference of

First and last books. Parallel of.

4. Besides these more general marks of unity in the poem, the individual structure of several of its integral parts offers curious evidence of consistency of plan in the whole. The first book, for example, in addition to prophecies and allusions to future occurrences, too emphatic to have been introduced without the intention of following them out to their fulfilment, contains, in the multiplicity and variety of its incidents, unequivocal proof of the opening scene of a long drama. Within these 600 verses are condensed materials sufficient in number and importance to have furnished several books each of equal length with the first, according to the mode in which Homer is accustomed to work up his subject when fairly embarked on it. As the events succeed each other, so the scene shifts with a rapidity unexampled elsewhere. The arrival of Chryses in the camp, his address to the assembled host, the refusal of his request by Agamemnon, and the acknowledgement of its justice by the troops, his departure and prayer to his patron deity, the descent of the god from Olympus, the ten days' ravages of his weapons, and the funeral rites of the victims are dispatched in less than fifty lines. The altercation between the chiefs, as the basis of the whole poem, is treated more at length. But even here the orations are far from copious. Nestor himself is comparatively

Minerva and Apollo in the Doloneа is hypercritical. There is here no direct combative participation in the conflict, to which alone the interdict of Jove can possibly refer. The ordinary divine interposition, by dreams, warnings, or otherwise, is expressly excepted from the general rule (VIII. 36. 466. sqq.). Accordingly, in the same context, almost the same verse of B. VIII., where Juno abandons her intention of succouring the Greeks from deference to her husband's order, she is yet said (218.) to have "instilled into Agamemnon's mind the necessity of immediately arming his troops, otherwise Hector would have succeeded in burning the fleet." Conf. XVI. 668., XI. 438.

brief. Then follow, in rapid succession, the shipment of the maiden for her home, the purification of the host, the delivery of Briseïs by Achilles to Agamemnon's heralds, the dialogue between Achilles and his mother, with his retrospective account of the sack of Thebes and capture of the prisoner whose ransom involved such fatal consequences. A change of scene transports us to Chrysa, where are described the delivery of the damsel to her father, with the sacrifice and banquet in honour of Apollo. Another change brings us back to Achilles, and a third conveys us to Olympus, where we have the promised interview between Thetis and Jove, with other scenes illustrative of the part taken by the different deities in the affairs of earth. In proportion to the number and importance of the events, the period of time occupied by this canto, upwards of three weeks, is more than double that allotted to the succeeding twenty-two books. In this accumulation of incidents may be traced, not so much any deliberate artifice, as the spontaneous anxiety of a mind pregnant with a great subject, to secure, by laying down at the outset a broad foundation of facts, a wide field for subsequent enlargement; and to rivet the attention of his reader, by launching him at once on the full stream of the narrative.

Nor are the evidences of that mixture of comprehensiveness and conciseness, which marks an introductory canto, less discernible in the style than in the matter of this book. Where the facts to be narrated in any poem are abundant, the ornamental details may be expected to be proportionally scanty; a rule generally exemplified in the text of Homer. No where, accordingly, are these elegant accessaries so

sparingly distributed as in this book. Throughout the Iliad, a favourite class of figurative embellishment is the Simile; and it is one which the fervour of the poet's imagination has at times led him to accumulate to a defective excess. The whole number of such figures in the poem is about 190, giving an average of about six for every 500 lines. The greatest proportion is in the description of battles, the part of the text which chiefly suggested and required some such relief to an otherwise monotonous recurrence of similar incidents. The sixteenth book, comprising 867 lines, has 20 similes; the seventeenth, 761 lines, has 19; the second, containing 877 lines, has 10. The smallest proportion observable in any one of the subsequent books gives one for 250 lines. In the first book, here under consideration, consisting of 611 lines, there occurs not one. This peculiarity explains itself as naturally by the number and importance of the historical incidents in Alpha, as the accumulation of purely illustrative matter, in the other books above cited, by the opposite character of their contents.

That the part containing, next to the first canto, the fewest embellishments of this class should happen to be the concluding one, though a curious, is no fortuitous coincidence. It forms part of a general and, as bearing on the present subject, important analogy between the two books. As in Alpha we trace, in the number and rapid succession of events, the opening; so in Omega, a like peculiarity indicates the winding up of a long narrative, and the anxiety of the poet to abridge the concluding details, after disposing of the main heads of action. The indignities inflicted on Hector's corpse; the council

of the gods; the mission of Iris to Thetis, of Thetis to Achilles; the interview between the goddess and her son; the mission of Iris to Priam; his journey, interview with Achilles, return with the body of Hector, and the subsequent preparation and performance of the funeral rites, comprise a mass of incidents equal in number, if not in importance, to those contained in the first act of the poem. They also, it happens, occupy an exactly equal period of time, about twenty-two or twenty-three days. These coincidences certainly offer a strong argument, not only of systematic design in the structure of the poem, but of that spontaneous harmony which marks the operations of the same genius under similar circumstances.

Another indication of an opening canto is a certain descriptive introduction, on their first appearance on the scene, of several of the less distinguished actors, a courtesy of which there is no example in other portions of the Iliad. The heroes of more universal renown, Achilles, Agamemnon, Ulysses, are indeed brought at once on the stage without any ceremony of announcement: but the other two chief performers in the first book, Nestor and Calchas, personages whose notoriety depended probably in a great measure on the Iliad, are each ushered in with a particular notice of their persons and qualities. There could be no reason for this more pointed personal description of these individuals in this canto than in any other, unless it were intended for the commencement of a series. The catalogue in the immediately following book precludes also, in a great degree, the necessity of such introductory notices in the sequel.

Second Book. Catalogue.

5. Similar indications of the preparatory stages of a great subject extend to the second book. Such,

for example, is Nestor's advice to Agamemnon to marshal his forces in distinct companies under their respective leaders. The natural inference here would be, apart from the general context, either that this advice had been offered in the first year of the war, or else that the Greeks had been accustomed, during the nine previous years, to engage the enemy without any sort of order or discipline, a very unsatisfactory alternative. This injunction, therefore, complied with by Agamemnon in the immediate sequel, is, like many other similar passages of both poems, but a piece of poetical mechanism forming a transition to the ensuing muster-roll of the Greek host. All sceptical inference is excluded, not merely by the previous and subsequent text, which proves the dialogue to have taken place in the ninth year, and after the quarrel, but by the distinct allusion of Nestor himself to these facts in the course of his speech.

The injunction of Iris to Priam to arm his forces, forming the introduction to the Trojan catalogue, presents another parallel anomaly, and for a similar object. Polites, a son of the Trojan king, sent out to reconnoitre, and whose person the goddess assumes, is here made to assert, "that although he had been in many an engagement, he had never beheld so numerous a host as that now advancing." Now it is certain that he must have known the Greek army to be much smaller than before, since, besides the heavy losses sustained in previous battles and the late pestilence, it was diminished by the whole amount of the Myrmidon force. This, therefore, is but a hyperbolical commonplace introductory to the Trojan march from the city.

The Catalogue is perhaps the portion of the poem

in favour of which a claim to separate authorship has been most plausibly urged. Although the example of Homer has since rendered some such formal enumeration of the forces engaged a common practice in epic poems descriptive of great warlike adventures, still so minute a statistical detail can neither be considered as imperatively required, nor perhaps such as would, in ordinary cases, suggest itself to the mind of a poet. Yet there is scarcely any portion of the Iliad where both historical and internal evidence are more clearly in favour of a connexion, from the remotest period, with the remainder of the work. The composition of the Catalogue, whensoever it may have taken place, necessarily presumes its author's acquaintance with a previously existing Iliad. It were impossible otherwise to account for the harmony observable in the recurrence of so vast a number of proper names, most of them historically unimportant, and not a few altogether fictitious; or of so many geographical and genealogical details as are condensed in these few hundred lines, and incidentally scattered over the thousands which follow. Equally inexplicable were the pointed allusions occurring in this episode to events narrated in the previous and subsequent text, several of which could hardly be of traditional notoriety, but through the medium of the Iliad. The composition of the Catalogue, and by consequence of the Iliad, at a very remote period, is further vouched for by the circumstance already referred to, that in the works of succeeding poets of very antient date, modelled more or less closely on the Iliad, similar catalogues were introduced. That contained in the Cypria was limited to the Trojan force, a fact which forms in itself a

conclusive argument that the Catalogue of the Iliad existed in its substantial integrity at the period when the Cypria was composed. Unless the enumeration of his native heroes had already been provided for, the author of that popular poem could never have restricted such a mark of distinction to their enemies. The style of the Catalogue is certainly far from deficient in the distinctive excellences of Homer. The genial spirit and vivacity infused into an otherwise dry recapitulation of names and facts, and the perspicuity, metrical harmony, and conciseness of their arrangement, reflect the single master mind as clearly perhaps as even the most brilliant descriptions in the body of the poem. Corrupted and interpolated it may have been: no part of the poem afforded, with so fair a field, so strong a temptation to such practices. Nor certainly are there wanting evidences of their having been resorted to. But interpolations in themselves imply the existence of an original genuine text.[1]

Tenth Book, or Dolonea.

In drawing this head of the subject to a close, the "Dolonea," or "night-watch," still demands a few words of remark. That the author of that episode was familiar with the previous narrative of the Iliad, even with the Catalogue, may be seen by reference to the epitome of its contents. The sleepless anxiety of Agamemnon during the night, owing to the gloomy prospects of his host after the disasters of the previous day; his allusion to the prowess of Hector as the immediate, and to his quarrel with Achilles as the remote cause of his distress; to the bivouac of the Trojans on the plain, to the construction of the rampart, and the posting of the guard; with the

[1] See Appendix D.

pointed mention of Rhesus of Thrace, unnoticed among the chiefs of that country in the Catalogue, as but recently arrived in the Trojan camp; all guarantee the previous existence of the first nine books of the poems in their substantial integrity. Nor, even were it not self-evident that this episode could only be intended as a continuation, not as a conclusion of the foregoing narrative, are there wanting sufficiently plain, though not quite so specific, allusions to a sequel. At the period therefore when the Dolonea was composed, an Iliad must have existed, whatever may have been its exact length or proportion. It happens, however, that, among these references of the episode to other parts of the existing text, there is not one indispensable to the full understanding of the action; nor is there any distinct allusion in the remaining books to the adventure which this one records. Although therefore the episode could not exist without the Iliad, the Iliad might no doubt exist without the episode. Upon this ground certain nameless commentators, alluded to by Eustathius[1], conjectured it to be a later addition to the primary fabric of the poem. On the other hand, the general harmony between its text and the remainder of the work, with the Homeric purity of its style, excluded all pretext for ascribing it to a different author. It was therefore admitted to be a genuine composition of Homer; not, however, an original canto of the Iliad, but a separate poem by the same author, first inserted in the place it now occupies by Pisistratus, the favourite hero of all such performances with this later school of sophists. Of the historical value of such theories, transmitted but on the hearsay

[1] Conf. Schol. Bekk. ad x. 1

of a Byzantine writer of the twelfth century, little need be added to what has already been remarked in other places.

The simple hypothesis however, that this book may have been an afterthought of the genuine Homer, need not in itself be considered as altogether unreasonable. Excellent as the structure of the Iliad is in its existing form, it does not follow, nay, it is highly improbable, that the poem was, even in its entire substance, so designed and finished off-hand, to use a familiar phrase, by a single impulse of its author. The conceptions of such a genius, in proportion as they are great, are not necessarily nor probably at once embodied in their full maturity. Ruder draughts of an Iliad may, no doubt, have preceded that which now forms so perfect a whole. Admitting the poem to have been originally composed without a Dolonea, the author himself could hardly have failed to discover that so long a series of national disaster and humiliation, extending over more than one half of the narrative, besides being poetically defective on the ground of monotony and sameness, might, if unrelieved by some such cheering episode, prove distasteful or even offensive to a patriotic audience. The tenth book, while it affords an agreeable relief to the national distress, also tends, through the force of contrast, to deepen its effect, and thus forms an indispensable element of the moral harmony of the entire action.

CHAP. VI.

HOMER. ILIAD. UNITY OF THE ACTION.

1. PRINCIPLE OF POETICAL UNITY, AS EXEMPLIFIED IN THE ILIAD. — 2. SIMPLICITY OF THE PLOT, AND ITS RANGE OF CHARACTERS. — 3. CHARACTER OF ACHILLES THE MAIN POETICAL FEATURE OF THE WORK. — 4. QUARREL OF ACHILLES AND AGAMEMNON. — 5. COURSE OF THE ACTION DURING THE SECESSION OF ACHILLES. NATIONAL PARTIALITIES OF HOMER. OBDURACY OF ACHILLES. — 6. RELAXATION OF HIS WRATH. DEFECTS AND ADVANTAGES OF THE CRISIS. — 7. ADAPTATION OF THE CHARACTERS OF ACHILLES AND PATROCLUS TO EACH OTHER. — 8. REVULSION OF FEELING. GRIEF AND REMORSE OF ACHILLES. FEROCITY OF ACHILLES. — 9. SOFTER FEATURES OF HIS CHARACTER. INTERVIEW WITH PRIAM. — 10. MORAL SCOPE AND TENDENCY OF THE ILIAD. — 11. AMPLIFICATION OF THE SUBJECT. EPISODES. DEFINITION OF THE TERM. — 12. CHARACTERISTICS OF HOMER'S EPISODES. — 13. CONTRAST OF VIRGIL.

Principle of poetical unity, as exemplified in the Iliad.

1. THE foundation of excellence in every branch of narrative composition is the talent of seizing and giving effect to the principal feature of a subject. The primary qualification of a skilful pleader is instinctively to apprehend the point in which the strength of his case lies, and constitute it the centre of his argument. The less momentous or less favourable details are either suppressed or scattered incidentally around, so that, like the decorative adjuncts of a solid building, they may acquire from the connexion an importance which they could not separately have enjoyed. The art of the historian is but a continued observance of the same rule. He arranges in the front of his narrative the main facts supplied by the Chronicle or Gazette; the less important circumstances which may there, from their bearing on the petty interests of the day, have been more carefully detailed, are abridged or discarded. Nor, certainly,

is the observanee of this principle less essential to the sueeess of the epie poet than of the historian or orator. It is, accordingly, in Homer's fine application of it that those artifices of his composition are to be sought, which, in the phraseology of the schools, are familiarly classed under the heads of unity of action, time, and place, or other similar figures of scholastic rhetorie. In order to test the justiee of this remark in its more immediate referenee to the Iliad, we must eonsider: first, the general tenor of the historical tradition on which the work is founded; seeondly, the speeial properties of that portion of the same tradition which has been selected as the principal action.

From the notices interspersed throughout the poem, it appears that the first nine years of the siege passed without any event of a decisive eharaeter. After a vigorous attempt to frustrate the landing of the Greeks, the Trojans, unable to eope with them in the field, shut themselves up within the walls of the eity, where, by the strength of its fortifications, they baffled every assault of the enemy.[1] The Greeks naturally shaped their tactics by those of the besieged, and, in order to wear out their resourees, occupied themselves in ravaging the eountry, and reducing other cities[2] of the hostile confederacy. In the tenth year however events oecurred to alter the Trojan poliey. Dissensions between Agamemnon and Achilles, the hero on whose valour the Greeks mainly relied for suceess, eaused the secession of the latter from the eause. In proportion as this event tended to discourage the one party, already somewhat disheartened by a long and unprofitable warfare, it revived the hopes of the other. The eity was at this epoch

[1] viii. 5., et locc. citt. in Ch. v. § 1. [2] ix. 328.

crowded with Asiatic auxiliaries, who, however valuable their services, pressed heavily on the resources of Priam[1], and rendered some desperate effort the more indispensable. Such a combination of circumstances obviously marked out this as the moment for a bold attack on the invaders. The quarrel therefore between the chiefs, as the immediate cause of a change in the languid character of the war, and of a series of fierce engagements involving the death of Hector the main bulwark of his country, but, above all, from the fine field it afforded for developing the character of Achilles, the heart and soul of the Iliad, could not fail to offer itself to the genius of Homer, as the centre or pivot of action in any poem founded on the siege of Troy.

Nor does the peculiar nature of these events mark out the completion of the design less clearly than its commencement. From the quarrel of the heroes down to the restoration of Hector's body, the whole series of occurrences follow each other by as constant a chain of cause and effect as the vibrations of a pendulum, and cease as naturally on the exhaustion of the impetus which set them in motion. On the withdrawal of Achilles depend the unwonted boldness and success of the Trojans. The disasters of the Greeks excite the sympathy of Patroclus, whose successful mediation with Achilles leads to his own death by the hand of Hector. Grief, anger, and remorse procure the immediate restoration of Achilles to the field, and the infliction of death on the destroyer of his friend. The duties of friendship and of religion indispensably require a performance of the last honours to the remains of the two fallen

[1] II. 130., XVII. 220. sqq., XVIII. 288. sqq.

warriors. While, therefore, up to this point the main events are inseparably linked with each other, it is equally certain that, beyond it, tradition supplies no occurrence standing in any similar epic relation to those which precede; nor is it easy to see how the ingenuity of poetical fiction could have suggested an addition calculated to form other than a tasteless excrescence. The subsequent adventures of the war, the closing career and death of Achilles, the arrival and exploits of Memnon, Penthesilea, Neoptolemus, furnished abundant materials for new poems: but even the genius of Homer could hardly have succeeded in bringing any one of those adventures into appropriate epic connexion with the narrative of the Iliad. In so far therefore the dogma of certain antient grammarians, that the first verse, nay, the first word of the poem contains a summary of the whole action, however frivolous their mode of propounding it, can hardly be considered as groundless in fact. The "anger of Achilles" and its consequences really include all that the Iliad relates, and exclude all that it omits.

Simplicity of the action, and its range of characters.

2. Skilfully, however, as the plot of the poem is devised, it will yet be found, in respect to actual events, to be but meagre. "The commander of an enterprise affronts his bravest warrior, who retires indignant from the field. Successive disasters lead to vain attempts to conciliate his anger. At length, when the enemy's fire threatens his own quarters, he allows his friend to go forth with his followers to the rescue. The death of that friend by the hand of the hostile leader imposes on him the duty of revenge; the fulfilment of which duty, terminating in the death of the rival chief, restores matters much to the same

footing as at the commencement." Nor is this simple line of action relieved by any of those ingenious underplots, by which succeeding epic poets have usually endeavoured to extend the interest of their narratives. In the Iliad are no cunning schemes of designing villains, treacherous friends, or jealous rivals, to baffle the designs of the principal actors; no attempts to mystify or conceal the proposed order of occurrences, in order to surprise or disappoint by unlooked-for disclosures. The opening of the poem contains a prediction of the events that are to follow during the greater part of its progress, and before we are far advanced we are made equally familiar with the remainder. The few unforeseen occurrences adorn, but do not impede, the smooth train of the principal action, which, gliding over them, advances steadily to its appointed issue.

This limitation of the main subject is not only a characteristic property of the poem, but one of its greatest excellences. In every department of art simplicity is an essential element of grandeur, and grandeur is the main feature of the Iliad. Any subordinate complication of parts would have detracted, in a proportional degree, from the dignity of the whole. It might, however, plausibly be urged, admitting the justice of this principle, that in so far as such secondary plots constitute the medium for exhibiting variety of character, their exclusion has deprived the poet of opportunity for portraying many of the passions and vices which supply not the least instructive lessons of human nature. In this alleged deficiency, however, consists another chief element of the ideal sublimity of the Iliad. The term hero, in the true spirit of the Homeric minstrelsy (whatever may be its sense in

the page of later mythology), excludes, as a general rule, without any actual exemption from the failings incident to humanity, those baser vices which inspire disgust or contempt. But the war of Troy was the greatest of all heroic adventures. The chiefs who took part in it were the noblest and the last of the race of genuine heroes. So they are described by both Homer and Hesiod[1], an intermediate stage between the divine and human natures, superior in moral and physical attributes as well to their sons and descendants as to the ordinary men of their own day. The degeneracy from heroism to common humanity is dated, by the latter poet expressly, by the former indirectly, from the extinction of this generation. It was natural therefore, in a selection of the Trojan war as his subject, that the poet's efforts to impart variety to his characters should be limited to such combinations of virtue and vice, greatness and weakness, as should still allow that essential attribute of heroism, generosity, to predominate. This limitation, while it rendered success the more difficult, rendered it also, if attained, the more complete; inasmuch as the sympathies called forth by human action or suffering are the more pure and pleasing, in proportion as they are less alloyed by the shame arising from exposure of the baser features of our nature. The gratification, therefore, which we derive from the Iliad's varied portraiture of imperfect excellence, if it ever admits of our remarking the absence of the villain of the piece, certainly never admits of our regretting it. Among the chief beauties of one of the greatest works of modern graphic art, the Last Supper of Leonardo, has been remarked the skill with which the

[1] Works and D. 165. 174.; conf. Od. II. 276., Il. XXIV. 454. alibi.

artist has varied the expression called forth on the countenances of eleven individuals of the same habits and interests by the sudden announcement of a fact in which they had all an equal concern, and where the predominant emotion in the breast of each was fundamentally the same: surprise at the imputation thrown out, and conscious innocence of the crime imputed. But in one this feeling is tempered with indignation, in another with doubt, in a third with humility, in a fourth with mortification, in a fifth with scorn. Similar is the power displayed by Homer in modifying the shades of his heroes' characters. All are actuated by a common spirit of chivalrous enterprise, all engaged in a common pursuit of martial renown; but differ no less in the peculiarities of disposition and language which mark their generous course, than in their capacities for attaining the glorious ends towards which it is directed.

Character of Achilles the main poetical feature of the Iliad.

3. But the grand poetical feature of the Iliad is the character of Achilles. Its conception is the highest effort of the poet's genius; on its delineation the richest resources of his art are concentrated. It is, accordingly, in the number and variety of the opportunities which the action supplies for developing the great qualities of the hero that its excellence mainly consists. This consideration renders it expedient, in the following pages, to combine the analysis of these two fundamental elements of the work: its epic structure, and the character of its protagonist.

The character of Achilles is conceived on the same principle which the sculptors of later ages transferred to their representations of the deity under human form. The hero of the Iliad, like the statues of Phidias, is an ideal personage, of which all the component parts

are human, but in their combination present a whole creature surpassing, in the splendour of his attributes, any living example of humanity; uniting the full measure of those qualities which, in the spirit of his age, constituted the sublime, the beautiful, or the terrible, in mortal nature. Beyond this general outline it is the more difficult to define wherein the grandeur of the portrait consists, owing to the wide difference in the moral impressions which many of its more prominent features are calculated to awaken in the present age, as compared with that for which it was originally designed. His valour, his generosity, the warm affections of his heart, the graces of his person, his elegant accomplishments, are common to him with most other heroes of chivalry. But there is in Achilles alone a power of exciting awe and admiration, which seems to depend on the less obvious associations through which it operates, and which can only be appreciated by identifying ourselves with the feelings or prejudices of the poet's own audience. Among the theories by which it has been attempted to illustrate the sources of our moral judgments, there is one which accounts for those habitually passed on certain passions or affections, not so much by reference to any essential difference in their quality, as to the degree in which they are displayed; or in other words that certain virtues, when carried to excess, become vices. Thus, when liberality exceeds the bounds of prudence, it becomes extravagance; a just regard for personal dignity degenerates into pride; a strong sense of retributive justice into vindictiveness. The right application of this rule depends, however, on the faculty of distinguishing where the transition from moderation to

excess takes place; a faculty reserved for the more advanced stages of ethic culture, or which is at least very imperfect in the primitive moralist. The estimate which the mind, undisciplined by the restraints of true religion or philosophy, forms of many modes of conduct which excite in more enlightened ages unqualified censure, is regulated chiefly by a previous estimate of the source in which they originate. Such as can be traced to some just or amiable impulse claim sympathy or approval, and the degree in which they are displayed tends less to alter their intrinsic value than to enhance the grandeur of their effect. Of this generous, though defective principle of heroic morality, the character of Achilles embodies the form and pressure. All his affections are in their origin noble or generous. This was indispensable to his heroic excellence. That all should be exhibited in excess was essential to his heroic greatness. His conscious superiority to all other mortals renders him haughty and impatient of control. Just resentment against ingratitude effervesces into implacable wrath, absorbing many of the best affections which at other times predominate in his bosom. The conflict of generous feelings created by the sudden loss of a beloved friend, leads to a bloodthirsty spirit of revenge against his destroyer. But, in order rightly to appreciate these darker traits, they must be contemplated, not in their naked magnitude and terror, but in their contrast to the softer touches by which they are relieved[1]; to the affectionate heart, the chivalrous sense of courtesy and urbanity, the spirit of mercy to the vanquished, and sympathy with affliction, for which the poet describes him as habitually distin-

[1] I. 334., XI. 599. sqq., XIX. 55—65., XXI. 100., XXIII., XXIV. 157.

guished, and of which his interview with Priam is so touching an example. Those harsher features may thus be likened, adopting the poet's own vein of imagery, to the thunder storm which, passing over the face of a beautiful landscape, imparts new charms to the returning serenity of the scene; or to the inundations of the mountain torrent, which disturb, but cannot permanently corrupt, the purity of its waters. Nor is it the least admirable part of this extraordinary portrait, that in so much boldness of design and intensity of colouring there is no exaggeration. Achilles frets, rages, storms, but he never rants. His most overwhelming paroxysms, which, in the heroes of other epic poems, seldom escape bombast or extravagance, are in him but the natural outbreaks of a noble, but wayward and impetuous spirit.

Quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon.

4. One great excellence of the quarrel scene which forms the foundation of the poem, is the skill with which the poet has managed to put both chiefs in the wrong, yet without any real sacrifice of their heroic dignity. The step taken by Achilles in calling the council, though obviously with the view of publicly arraigning the conduct of his commander, is open to no serious charge of presumption. It was the duty, as well as privilege, of the leading champion of the army to stand forth as its protector against the reckless levity even of a superior, who had subjected it, for the indulgence of his own selfish passions, to the wrath of the terrible deity under whose weapons it was smarting. Achilles is also careful to secure the divine sanction, by placing his cause in the hands of the seer Calchas. His subsequent conduct, however, cannot be so easily justified. His reply to the prophet's demand of support, should his candour

embroil him with Agamemnon, is in a strain of sarcasm against that hero altogether unwarranted at this stage of the discussion; and tends to provoke, if not to palliate, the indecent abuse with which Agamemnon assails the divine minister. In the sequel, the violence of both parties renders it the less easy to discriminate on whose side lies the balance of right or wrong. Agamemnon's offer to restore the damsel, on condition of compensation at the common cost for the loss of his share of the spoil, if not the most generous mode of settlement, was certainly one which he was entitled to propose; and the taunting reply of Achilles provokes, and in some degree excuses, the declaration of Agamemnon in his retort, to indemnify himself at the sole expense of the Myrmidon chief. The patience of the impetuous hero is now exhausted, and his fury reaches a climax which renders divine interference necessary. The appearance of Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, to check the violence of Achilles, is an obvious figure of his own better judgment suggesting, even in the climax of his wrath, that a personal assault would be a far less effective mode of chastising the insolence of his chief, or the apathy of his fellow-warriors, than a secession from the war; which, by proving their dependance on his valour, would secure to him in the end a more complete triumph, and to them a more humiliating punishment.

The circumstance here noticed of the anger of Achilles being directed, not only against Agamemnon but his companions in arms, supplies an apt illustration of a familiar and just remark of the antient critics, that Homer seldom tells us any thing in his own words which can be appropriately communicated in those of his heroes. Nowhere has the poet himself

given to understand that the wrath of Achilles extended beyond the single person of Agamemnon: but the omission is abundantly made good in the dramatic element of the action. On the departure of Pallas, the hero indirectly, but severely, taunts the Greeks with their slavish acquiescence in the injustice of their commander: "Rapacious king, didst thou not reign over worthless vassals, this outrage had been thy last." [1] In the sequel he accuses them collectively of having wronged him [2]; and at a later period he chides Patroclus for his sympathy with their distress, suffering, as they were, but the just reward of their guilt.[3] This ingredient of the hero's wrath is indeed indispensable, to explain or palliate his implacable bitterness of feeling even towards his own favourite comrades. But although their conduct, in thus passively allowing their champion and preserver to be slighted and despoiled, may have afforded him reasonable ground of offence, it admits of excuse or even justification. There is no moral obligation more distinctly enjoined in the Iliad than obedience to the supreme authority. Amid a full liberty of advice and remonstrance, a respectful deference to the sovereign will of Agamemnon is a duty indirectly, but pointedly, inculcated by the poet, and on all occasions scrupulously fulfilled by the other chiefs.[4] In the quarrel, whatever its intrinsic merits, the respective position of the litigants imposed on Achilles the duty of moderation, or even submission. To his brothers in arms, therefore, he might naturally appear to have forfeited by his violence much of the advantage derived from the

[1] I. 231. [2] I. 299. [3] XVI. 18.
[4] I. 277., II. 203. sq. 346., IV. 401. sqq. 411. sqq.

justice of his cause. Nor here again has the poet, however sparing of his personal explanations, left us dependant on conjecture. Nestor, who represents the sober judgment of the host, incidentally but distinctly intimates that, however Atrides may have been to blame, Achilles, by his insubordination, had shifted a large portion of the fault from his commander to himself.[1]

Course of the action after the secession of Achilles.

5. After his interview with Thetis, Achilles retires, to nurse in solitude his indignation and hopes of speedy triumph. The preparation for this result supplies materials for the seven succeeding cantos. The poet's concern for the honour of his countrymen required that their disgrace should be brought about slowly and gradually, after a long and valiant struggle for their previous ascendancy. Accordingly, as has been observed by a celebrated critic, "the distress thickens as the poem advances, while everything is so contrived as to aggrandise Achilles, and render him, even when absent, the capital figure." The succeeding battles are enlivened by the introduction of new characters, and by episodes illustrative of the history of the leading heroes.

National partialities of Homer.

Among the most striking internal evidences of unity of design in the Iliad, is the expedient by which the poet has guarded lest the disasters of his countrymen should involve any compromise of that superiority, moral and martial, which he throughout ascribes to them over their Trojan adversaries. An anxiety to sustain the character of his own country, is a feeling which might be expected to influence every poet. But that several poets, under the self-imposed necessity of recording the defeat and humi-

[1] Conf. locc. sup. citt.

liation of their ancestors, should resort to the same subtle device for preserving the national honour seems next to impossible. This device consists chiefly in veiling his patriotic sympathies under a general tone of impartiality, or even of occasional favour to the Trojans; while, wherever we are left to judge from facts, the advantage is entirely on the Greek side. The Iliad abounds in allusions to the noble defence of their country by the besieged, and to the cruel fate which destined so valiant a race to destruction by a vindictive invader. Our feelings are frequently moved by the touching appeals of the orphan, the widow, and the parent, on their successive bereavements. Yet, as if these images of afflicted patriotism, or oppressive ambition, were not effectually dissipated by the notorious reality that all the distress was but the punishment of crime, all the aggression but a righteous attempt to obtain redress, the Trojans, at the very outset, are made parties to a new act of perjury and assassination. The assault of Pandarus on Menelaus, if it can be reconciled, through the common expedient of ascribing the act to divine instigation, with the poet's principle of exempting the heroes of the Iliad from the baser vices, is certainly the nearest approach to a violation of that principle in the poem. It tends, consequently, still further to lower the character of the Dardanian warriors as compared with their Hellenic rivals. Other gross examples of Trojan treachery are episodically cited from the earlier transactions between the two nations.[1] Similar art has been employed in the military parallel of the two. While the courage of the Trojan chiefs is frequent subject of warm eulogy, yet, wherever

[1] XI. 138.

brought into fair personal collision with Greeks of equal rank, they are worsted. Despite the assurance that even Achilles had been known to "turn pale on meeting Hector or Æneas face to face," yet the former of these two heroes not only, when actually brought into collision with Pelides, flies panic-struck, but is repeatedly beaten in single combat by both Ajax and Diomed. The superiority indeed of Diomed to Hector, Æneas, and all other Trojans, wherever the gods do not interpose, is maintained in every encounter. Menelaus defeats Paris, Patroclus Sarpedon. Nowhere is any Greek warrior of rank subjected to humiliating discomfiture. The proudest exploit of Hector, his slaughter and spoliation of Patroclus, is so described as to be conspicuous merely for its ferocity. The Greek hero, after being disabled by Apollo, is mortally wounded by another Trojan, when Hector steps in with the finishing blow, as his butcher rather than conqueror. When the same Hector, guaranteed against personal risk by the assurance of divine protection, challenges the best warrior of the Greek host, he is described in a like ironical spirit as spreading terror through its ranks; yet in a few minutes no less than eight champions come forward, and he only escapes death from the one he engages by the interposition of the heralds. To the ultimate defeat of the Greeks it is required that, besides the secession of Achilles and Patroclus, the flower of their remaining warriors, Agamemnon, Diomed, Ulysses, should be disabled by wounds. The Trojan leaders on the other hand, Hector, Æneas, Sarpedon, Paris, are successively, when vanquished, either preserved from harm by their patron deities, or, if wounded, miraculously cured and restored

to the battle. The successes of the Trojans collectively are throughout described as due to the special agency of the gods; those of the Greeks are often the result of their own valour, even in the face of the same divine influence which, in their own case, is required to paralyse their power of resistance before they can be subjected to defeat. The Trojan leaders never venture on hostile collision with adverse deities; the Greek heroes engage them repeatedly and successfully. Nor do the former ever appear great in calamity, stemming by their solitary valour the adverse tide of war. Numerous instances of this highest order of courage are to be found on the side of the Greeks.

Obduracy of Achilles.

The first day's combat terminates with little positive advantage on either side. This, however, is already a serious decline in the fortunes of the Greeks. "While Achilles fought, the Trojans never ventured from beneath the protection of their city walls." [1] The construction of the rampart during the truce is, therefore, a tribute to his glory at the expense of that of the army, and is claimed as such by himself.[2] The result of the ensuing disastrous combat is the "Supplication" of Atrides for relief. The hero's triumph was now complete, but not the measure of Agamemnon's punishment or his own satisfaction. It was hardly to be expected that repentance, so evidently originating in mere self-interest, should at once obtain grace. Nor was the resentment of Achilles of that vulgar kind which depends on a balance struck between the amount of insult received and apology offered. The ideal grandeur of his

[1] iv. 512., et locc. citt. in Ch. v. § 1.

[2] ix. 352.

character required that no inferior order of influence should have power to bend a resolution he had deliberately formed and pronounced. His anger therefore, when the period arrived for its removal, was not to be appeased, but supplanted by some still more powerful affection. This transition introduces the second act of the great moral drama of the Iliad, where Achilles was to be exhibited under a new class of equally powerful emotions, but tempered by softer ingredients.

Relaxation of his wrath. Defects and advantages of the crisis.

6. In the conference of the ninth book, there betrays itself, under his apparent obduracy, a lurking regret to abandon his prospects of martial glory, and an anxiety that circumstances might occur, without detriment to his honour, to restore him to the field of battle. As the national distress approaches its climax, symptoms appear of a relaxation of his wrath, in a spirit of compassion for one of its innocent victims.[1] That this first object of his sympathy, the physician Machaon, should combine with his military duties the most beneficent art of peace, can hardly be attributed to accident. Patroclus, deeply moved by the distress of his countrymen, avails himself of this opening to ask and obtain permission to lead forth the Myrmidons to their relief, but on condition of his confining his succour to the delivery of the camp. The mode, however, in which this permission is granted shows that it was not merely a concession to friendship, but extorted partly by the danger which threatened the Myrmidon quarters. For, immediately afterwards, observing the flames rising from the ship which Hector had set on fire, Achilles becomes himself urgent with

[1] xi. 599.

his lieutenant to arm without delay, and undertakes in person the office of marshalling his troops. Powerful as is the interest of this crisis, there is perhaps no portion of the action which affords so fair an opening for censure. The moment being now arrived which Achilles had from the first foreseen might render his interference necessary for the safety of his own ships, why, it may be asked, should he throw upon Patroclus alone the burthen of their protection; exposing his beloved friend, for the gratification of his own obstinate pride, to a risk, the magnitude of which was afterwards so fatally proved? If himself so alarmed as to hurry on the arming of his troops, was he not bound to march forth at their head, rather than maintain at the sole peril of Patroclus a mere shadow of adherence to his purpose? The only apology which occurs is, that a sense of danger was what entered least into the thoughts of a hero when going forth himself, or sending his friend to battle. The predominant feeling of Achilles in such a moment would be, not alarm for the welfare of Patroclus, but envy of the achievements in store for him. Reflexion followed afterwards.

The poetical advantage, on the other hand, of this mode of management is obvious. It was essential to the complete working out of the character of Achilles, that, wherever he was called to act a prominent part, he should appear under some powerful stimulus. Had his return to the ranks been voluntary, as a concession to the prayers or peace-offerings of his fellow-chiefs, his first appearance on the field would have been comparatively tame and insipid: had it been forced from him by the assault on his own quarters, he would have gone forth under

humiliating, almost ludicrous, circumstances; he would, in fact, have been burnt out of his tent, and liable to the taunt of having been caught in the snare he had set for others. Or again, had Patroclus fallen fighting by the side of his chief in the ranks, there would have been little to distinguish his fate from that of other unfortunate warriors, nor, consequently, either motive or apology for those subsequent revulsions of feeling,—grief, shame, remorse,—on the part of Achilles, so indispensable to the fulness of his portrait, or for those ebullitions of vindictive fury against Hector, which give the tone to the whole subsequent action. One more important benefit resulting from this mode of management was, the easy and natural opening it afforded for cordial reconciliation with his fellow chiefs, in the debt of gratitude imposed on him by their gallant fulfilment of his own neglected duty, of stemming the adverse tide of war to rescue the body of his friend.

Character of Patroclus. Its adaptation to that of Achilles.

7. Nowhere, perhaps, has the poet more finely displayed his knowledge of human nature than in the adaptation to each other of the characters of his hero and his hero's friend. Between men of ordinary tempers, attachments are perhaps more easily cemented where there is a near similarity of disposition: but with men of high passions or eccentric minds, the risks of collision are too great to admit of that harmony essential to the maintenance of strong personal friendship. A certain contrast is perhaps, in every case, more favourable to a reciprocal estimate of character than close resemblance. There cannot therefore be a happier selection of the opposite, but not uncongenial qualities which were here to be exhibited in such harmonious conjunction.

Among the varieties of heroic character shadowed forth in the Iliad, the virtues for which Patroclus was especially distinguished were, benevolence, tenderness of heart, and amiable manners.[1] This is the disposition which experience shows to be alone or chiefly calculated to secure the affections, or influence the mind, of such a being as Achilles. Yet, even under these favourable conditions, the Thessalian hero's impetuosity of temperament scarcely admitted a very cordial bond of union with an equal. It was necessary therefore that the relation between them, without involving any servile subjection, should partake of that between patron and client, or chieftain and vassal. Menœtius the father of Patroclus was a noble stranger, driven with his only son, by adverse destiny, from his own country, to seek an asylum at the court of Peleus. The young refugee had been educated with Achilles, also an only child, on the mixed footing of companion and dependant. He was the elder of the two, and the influence he had obtained over his youthful patron by his amiable qualities was such, that the last act of Menœtius, on sending him forth to the war[2], was, in the presence and with the sanction of Peleus, to charge him with the duty of moderating the dangerous ardour of the Myrmidon prince's temper. Friendship indeed were but a feeble term to express the feelings entertained by Achilles towards his beloved comrade, whom he "honoured equal to his own soul." In the hero of the Iliad, the tender like the terrible passions required to be made up of more than ordinary ingredients; and in the fulness of his affection were thus

[1] xvi. 2 sq., xvii. 671., xix. 282—300.

[2] xi. 785.

united, personal respect, fraternal love, and reverence for the will of a parent whom he was destined never again to see.

Revulsion of feeling. Grief and remorse of Achilles.

8. The companion in arms who occupied the next place to Patroclus in his esteem is selected to convey the fatal intelligence. It is abruptly communicated. Artificial breaking of bad news were little in the spirit of the true heroic minstrelsy. The violence of the transition is more judiciously obviated by representing Achilles, before the arrival of Antilochus, as already foreboding the truth, from certain appearances in the battle as viewed from the rampart.[1] The description of the effect produced by its full announcement is of the last degree of splendour. After the first paroxysms of grief, those reflexions on his late conduct, formerly excluded by the excitement of other passions, press on him with terrific force. The full conviction how recklessly he had exposed his friend, deprived of his protecting arm, to the fury of an enemy appointed as the instrument of his own wrath against the whole Hellenic host, now flashes upon his mind. Now was the time to remember, that, so long as he maintained his purpose of absenting himself from the field, the gods had at his own request decreed victory to Hector, rout and slaughter to the Greeks. No exception had been made in favour of Patroclus. Now was the time to curse that blind indulgence of his selfish pride which had blunted all the more generous affections of his nature. The bitterness of his soul, harassed by these tormenting thoughts, at length finds vent in language, which could anything contribute to ennoble, it would be its having been deemed worthy

[1] xviii. 6. sqq.

of citation among the last words of Socrates, as transmitted by Plato.[1]

No less striking is the transition, in his dialogue with his mother, from remorse to the thirst of vengeance, and of what, amid all his mental vicissitudes, is never lost sight of, fresh glory to be acquired in its exaction. The succeeding scenes are so many new illustrations of other traits of grandeur in his character. His simple appearance on the ramparts, uttering his shout of war, spreads rout and panic through the Trojan host. In his frank reconciliation with Agamemnon his native generosity shines forth unsullied. No studied attempt to maintain dignity or exact terms. Apologies unheeded, gifts disregarded; everything at once forgotten and forgiven. The ensuing books at length exhibit the mighty hero on the field of battle, when Jupiter himself pronounces divine interference necessary to balance the contest; and the gods are despatched in a body, to guard lest the impetuosity of his prowess should violate the decrees of fate by the premature sack of the city.

Ferocity of Achilles.

His ferocious treatment of the corpse of Hector cannot but offend, as referred to the modern standard of humanity. The heroic age however must be judged by its own moral laws. Retributive vengeance on the dead, as well as the living, was a duty inculcated by the religion of those barbarous times, which not only taught that evil inflicted on the author of evil was a solace to the injured man, but made the welfare of the soul after death dependant on the fate of the body from which it had separated. Hence a denial of the rites deemed

[1] XVIII. 98.; conf. Plat. Ap. Soc. p. 28. D.

essential to the soul's admission into the more favoured regions of the lower world, was a cruel punishment to the wanderer on the dreary shores of the infernal river. The pathetic complaint of the ghost of Patroclus to Achilles, of but a brief postponement of his own obsequies[1], shows how efficacious their refusal to the remains of his destroyer must have been in satiating the thirst of revenge, which, even after death, was supposed to torment the dwellers in Hades. Hence, before yielding up the body of Hector to Priam, Achilles asks pardon of Patroclus for even this partial cession of his just rights of retribution.[2] The corpse of Patroclus had also, it must be remembered, been insulted, stripped, and mutilated, by this very Hector, and was destined, had it remained in his power, to usage similar to that now inflicted on his own.[3] Such being the primitive Pagan law of retributive equity, the extent to which the poet has here called it into action was essential to his conception of the character of Achilles, in whom no affection, amiable or the reverse, could exist but in overpowering excess. The same apology extends to his other outbreaks of vindictive fury; to the slaughter of the twelve human victims on the pile of his friend, and the refusal of quarter to his prisoners. This latter suspension of his usual humane rule of conduct is, also, pointedly ascribed by himself to the obligations of vengeance imposed on him by the fate of Patroclus.[4]

Gentler features of his character. Interview with Priam.

9. The funeral games usher in an agreeable change. Soothed by the fulfilment of his duties of mourner, he appears, as director of the festivity, adorned by all the gentler graces of courtesy and humanity, as

[1] xxiii. 69. [2] xxiv. 592. [3] xvii. 125. sqq. [4] xxi. 100.

displayed more especially in the marked respect, or even reverence, of his manner towards Agamemnon. His interview with Priam elicits traits of a still nobler order. The obligations both of vengeance and friendship had now been amply satisfied. Patroclus might exult among his companions in the shades, in the glory of his passage from the upper world; and a twelve days' interval had relaxed the intensity of his own feelings. At this juncture, the venerable Priam suddenly appears before him as a suppliant for the body of his son; and the occasion is seized by the poet for placing the keystone to this model of heroic perfection. That stern bosom, lately so inflexible by any influence but its own fierce passions, now melts with pity for an aged parent worn down by domestic and public calamity, and with admiration for the heroism which impelled him, alone, through the dangers of a Myrmidon camp, into the presence of an enemy whose hands were still red with the blood of his children. Yet even here, in the performance of the humanest duties, the darker characteristics of the hero's nature are finely preserved. When Priam, emboldened by his unexpected kindness, having obtained so much more than he had reason to hope, ventures to insist on more than was reasonable to demand, to exact the promised boon on his own terms rather than receive it on those of the donor, both he and we are reminded of the former Achilles, by the terrible though momentary change of tone, in which he warns the trembling old man to beware, while profiting by the generosity of the lion, lest he should rouse its fury.[1]

And here we part with Achilles, at the moment

[1] xxiv. 559. sqq.

best calculated to exalt and purify our impression of his character. We had accompanied him through the effervescence, undulations, and final subsidence of his stormy passions. We now leave him in repose, and under the full influence of the more amiable affections: while our admiration of his great qualities is chastened by the reflection, that, within a few short days, the mighty being in whom they were united was himself to be suddenly cut off in the full vigour of their exercise,

"et de tam magno restaret Achille,
Nescio quid, parvam quod non bene compleat urnam."

The frequent and touching allusions, interspersed throughout the Iliad, to the speedy termination of its hero's course, and the moral on the vanity of human life which they inculcate, are among the finest evidences of the spirit of ethic unity by which the whole framework of the poem is animated.

Moral scope and tendency of the Iliad.

10. This indissoluble connexion between the genius of the entire poem and of its protagonist, while constituting the fundamental characteristic of the Iliad, involves also certain collateral peculiarities in its bond of epic unity, as compared with other standard works of its class. The action of all the remaining more celebrated productions of the epic muse may be described as directed *towards* their main point of interest; that of the Iliad is concentrated *around* it. In the Odyssey the restoration of Ulysses to his home and royal authority, in the Æneid the establishment of the Trojan dominion in Latium, in the Jerusalem the reconquest of the Holy Sepulchre, in the Paradise Lost the fall of our first parents, offer each a distinct historical object, on which the action is from the first steadily advancing, by however

tortuous a course. In the Iliad no similar object can be discovered. Although the limits of the action are as clearly marked out as in any of the above cases, yet its progress cannot be said to have in view, nor does its conclusion involve, any distinct historical consummation. The fall of Troy, the grand catastrophe of the whole train of events celebrated in the poem, is extraneous to its own narrative. As little does the reconciliation of the chiefs, or the death of Hector, form its definitive scope. The selection, therefore, of this particular series of events was owing obviously to its moral, rather than its historical importance; to the opportunities it afforded for portraying the great qualities of one extraordinary character, with the conception of which the poet's mind was teeming. The genius of the Iliad, consequently, is superior to that by which those other heroic poems are animated, in so far as the mind of man, in all the depth and variety of its passions and affections, is a more interesting object of study than the vicissitudes of human destiny or worldly adventure.

The term Moral, which, owing to the poverty of this branch of our ethical vocabulary, has here been used in its wider sense, to distinguish the inner intellectual design from the external or historical facts of the poem, must not be understood to indicate, as it might according to its more familiar import, any of that formal didactic spirit which frequently pervades the epic compositions of civilised ages. There is nothing of this tendency in the "moral" element of the Iliad. But although the main scope of the epic muse is rather to entertain by the description of great events or remarkable characters, than to illustrate speculative ethic doctrines, still, as those

descriptions must more or less act on the moral feelings, it is at least desirable that the impression made should be beneficial rather than mischievous. There is, besides, a natural aversion in the human mind to contemplate evil triumphant and virtue degraded, which renders such exhibitions offensive to the taste as well as the understanding, and in so far injurious to the poetical as well as the ethic spirit of works of imagination. In respect to this just amount of didactic propriety, the Iliad, both in the general scheme and the details of its action, well sustains its superiority of character. Each of the actors in the ruling transaction of the poem, Achilles and Agamemnon, are in their respective mode and degree in the wrong. Each is reduced, by the disasters consequent on his error, to bitter repentance and humiliation. The treachery of Pandarus is the immediate cause of his own death. He is the first hero of note slain in the engagement which it was the special object of that treachery to bring on. Of the two great nations engaged in the war, the Greeks were the hostile invaders; but their cause is based on justice, and we therefore readily sympathise with the poet's anticipation of their ultimate success. On the other hand, amid our concern for the cruel fate of the amiable Hector, and the grief of his desolate family, the reflexion that they are all more or less accomplices in the outrages of Paris and Pandarus, forces us to acknowledge the hand of retributive justice in the infliction of the scourge. Helen is represented as unhappy in her adulterous state, often brooding mournfully over the past[1], and exposed to mortification and slight even from her paramour's

[1] III. 139. 173., VI. 345. sqq., XXIV. 764.

kinsfolk.[1] Paris himself is exhibited as an object of dislike and contempt, both to his own countrymen and the Greeks; and although he escapes death by the hand of Menelaus, we are warned that his final punishment is at hand.

Contrast of the Æneid.

This excellence of Homer will appear the more remarkable, as contrasted with the striking inferiority of his most distinguished successor in regard to the same important feature, amid the full light of ethic science and philosophy. The hero of the Æneid is held up by its author as a model of piety and virtue. But how sadly do we miss that harmony between the dramatic and the descriptive elements of the poem, so beautifully maintained in the Iliad! In all the principal transactions in which Æneas is engaged, his real character and conduct are in open conflict with Virgil's description. In his connexion with Dido, if he be supposed to have had no ulterior object in view, he must be condemned as a heartless sensualist. If, as the poet implies, that connexion was formed under the faith of a virtual marriage, he becomes a perjured adulterer; while his cold solemn indifference to the misery caused by his cruel and ungrateful treatment of an amiable and confiding female is odious in the last degree. His invasion of Italy is an act of open usurpation and outrage. His arrival on the coast spreads discord and bloodshed among the previously happy tribes of that country. A father forces his daughter to violate her plighted troth, a mother is driven to suicide by the evils accumulated on her family and nation. All our partialities ought to be on the side, not of the hero whose cause we are called on to espouse, and which

[1] xxiv. 768. sqq.

is crowned with success, but on that of his adversary. The only palliation which can be suggested for these moral blemishes of the Æneid, the divine authority under which the hero acts, tends, if rightly estimated, but to aggravate the offence, by exhibiting not only weak humanity, but the Deity himself as the patron of injustice and oppression.

Amplification of the subject.

11. Next to these higher features of poetical excellence in the composition of the Iliad, the property which demands attention is, the equable perspicuity of its narrative. It is perhaps the only epic poem of great length and variety of adventure, which can be read through without the consciousness of any such breaks or interruptions of the natural course of events, as to require, from time to time, a certain effort to revive impressions of former transactions, requisite to the full understanding of those in which we are engaged. The action pursues one continuous course, unentangled by either side plots, anticipations, or retrospective narratives, involving abrupt transitions from one branch of subject to another. In the Odyssey, a work of less dignified order, the poet has followed a different method, and apparently sought to increase its interest by the same multiplicity of events and complexity of arrangement which he avoids in the Iliad. The example of the former work has been preferred by his successors, none of whom have aspired to the more simple concentrated unity which distinguishes his great masterpiece. Such scantiness however of fundamental materials, required, in order to secure variety and spirit to the narrative, a proportional richness in that subordinate class of incident or descriptive detail which may be comprehended under the general term of Amplifi-

cation. This subsidiary element of the action may here be considered as of two kinds, the first of which consists in the mere extension of the general narrative of the poem; the second is that peculiar species of accessory matter familiarly termed Episode.

The epic poet of Homer's day was also the popular historian. His duty was to embody the events he celebrated in such a form as should secure them a permanent hold on the national sympathies. One effective mode, therefore, of varying the course of a naturally limited subject would be, to replenish it with collateral notices of men or events of personal interest to the audience. Such is the catalogue of forces, offering a concise summary of Greek geography and family history. Such are the genealogies, and tales of old heroic exploit, interspersed here and there as opportunity occurred. Hence too the number and duration of the battles, securing to so many different heroes a prominent share in the achievements of this great national war.

As a general rule, these excursions tend as much to adorn as to vary the narrative. At times however it must be allowed that the poet on such occasions, according to the familiar proverb, inclines to slumber, and wanders into trivialities of action or dialogue well calculated to produce a similar disposition on the part of his readers. As an example may be adduced the long colloquy of Idomeneus, first with the god Neptune afterwards with his own esquire Meriones[1], explaining the motives which had induced those two Cretan heroes temporarily to quit the field, and describing the quantity and proper disposal of the arms and accoutrements stored up in

[1] XIII. 219. sq.

their quarters. The oratory of Nestor, the poet's favourite mouthpiece of heroic tradition, though always in good keeping with his character, is also perhaps at times unduly discursive.

Episodes. Definition of the term.

The foregoing examples belong chiefly to the class of amplification above characterised as the extension of the general course of the narrative. The most important class however is that comprised under the head of Episode. This term in the old critical vocabulary had a wider import than now familiarly attaches to it. Aristotle[1] seems to extend it to every species of circumstantial detail beyond the fundamental facts of the story, in his well known definition of the action of the Odyssey: "A man, after having been many years absent from his home, a solitary wanderer and persecuted by Neptune, while his goods are plundered and his family oppressed by his wife's suitors, at length returns, alone and in distressed condition; when discovering himself to a few friends, he succeeds, with their aid, and without personal loss or damage, in destroying his enemies. This forms the proper subject of the poem, the remainder is but episode." According to this definition the phrase would comprehend a large portion of every epic poem, and of the Iliad more especially. It will here be taken in the more limited signification which it usually bears in the language of modern criticism, as applicable to such portions of the text as could not only be omitted without a serious breach of continuity in the principal action, but themselves possess such a subordinate degree of integrity, that, if recited alone, they would constitute a more or less distinct body of epic narrative. The

[1] De Art. Poet. xviii.

most important episodes of this class in the Iliad are: the visit of Hector to Troy in the sixth book; the Dolonea, or midnight expedition of Ulysses and Diomed, in the tenth; the description of the Shield of Achilles; the Funeral Games; the dialogues between Priam and Helen in the third book, Diomed and Glaucus in the sixth, and Æneas and Achilles in the twenty-first.

Characteristics of Homer's episodes.

12. Episodes, in this narrower sense, admit of a further distinction of character, founded on their greater or less coherence with the principal subject. The Dolonea, for example, and the Funeral Games, though not indispensable, are continuous portions of the main narrative; the address of Glaucus to Diomed, and of Æneas to Achilles, are occupied with matter altogether extraneous to it. The episodes of this latter class in the Iliad are comparatively brief. Here we have another proof of the poet's judgment. The fundamental law for the use of all such accessaries is, that they should offer no unseasonable interruption to the main subject. Their length therefore should, as a general rule, be regulated by their degree of connexion with it. Wherever they seriously divert attention from it, they cannot with propriety be so freely prolonged, as when they merely extend and vary its natural course.

The poet's method of introducing his episodes, also illustrates in a curious manner his tact in the dramatic department of his art. Where, for example, one or more heroes are despatched on some commission, to be executed at a certain distance of time or place, the fulfilment of their task is not, as a general rule, immediately described. A certain interval is allowed them for reaching the appointed scene of action,

which interval is dramatised, as it were, either by a temporary continuation of the previous narrative, or by fixing attention for a while on some new transaction, at the close of which the further account of the mission is resumed. The examples of this mode of management, which extends also to other portions of the text besides episodes in the proper sense, offer, in the closeness of their parallel, no unimportant evidence of unity of workmanship. In the heat of the battle called the "Prowess of Diomed," Hector is sent by the seer Helenus with instructions to the Trojan matrons to propitiate the aid of Minerva. He sets out for the city, and the interval necessary for his journey was to be made good. The description of the battle might for this purpose have been continued. In this way however, owing to the sameness of the occurrences, we should have remained comparatively stationary. As a more effectual mode of preventing time from standing still, the hero whose valour was the cause of the mission, is engaged in a new variety of chivalrous adventure, supplying one of the most interesting pieces of family history in the whole cycle of Hellenic tradition.[1] At the conclusion of the tale we rejoin Hector, already arrived at the gate of the city.

On the mission of the heralds for Priam, to ratify the conditions of single combat between Paris and Menelaus, the interval is similarly made good by the dialogue on the city walls, an episode of nearly as distinct character as the dialogue between Diomed and Glaucus.

In the first book Ulysses, having been appointed to restore Chryseïs to her father, prepares his vessel

[1] vi. 119. sqq.

and crew, and sets sail. The poet then leaves him to pursue his voyage, resumes for a while the affairs of the camp, and then, rejoining him already arrived at Chrysa, completes the account of the mission.

In the seventeenth book Antilochus is despatched from the field of battle to the camp, to announce the death of Patroclus to Achilles. The adventures of the battle are then continued to the conclusion of the canto, and at the commencement of the next the messenger is found already at the tent of the Myrmidon chief.

In the eighteenth book, Thetis, after promising to procure from Vulcan a new suit of armour for her son, is dismissed on her journey to Olympus. The poet then reverts to the transactions of the camp, and, after a proper interval, rejoins Thetis at the residence of the god.

The concise simplicity of the terms in which the subject, in each case, is relinquished or resumed, gives additional point to the parallel:

VI. 116. ὣς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπέβη κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ . . .
sqq. Episode of Diomed and Glaucus during 121 lines.
237. Ἕκτωρ δ' ὡς Σκαιάς τε πύλας καὶ φηγὸν ἵκανεν.

III. 116. Ἕκτωρ δὲ προτὶ ἄστυ δύω κήρυκας ἔπεμπεν. . .
sqq. Episode of Priam and Helen during 129 lines.
245. κήρυκες δ' ἀνὰ ἄστυ θεῶν φέρον ὅρκια πιστά.

I. 312. οἱ μὲν ἔπειτ' ἀναβάντες ἐπέπλεον ὑγρὰ κέλευθα . .
Transactions in the camp during 118 lines.
αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
430. ἐς Χρύσην ἵκανεν ἄγων ἱερὴν ἑκατόμβην.

XVII. 700. τὸν μὲν δακρυχέοντα πόδες φέρον ἐκ πολέμοιο . . .
Continuation of combat during 63 lines.

xviii. 2. Ἀντίλοχος δ' Ἀχιλῆϊ πόδας ταχὺς ἄγγελος ἦλθεν.

148. τὴν μὲν ἄρ' Οὐλυμπόνδε πόδες φέρον . . .

Transactions in the camp during 220 lines.

369. Ἡφαίστου δ' ἵκανε δόμον Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα.[1]

The Odyssey[2] contains examples of the same method: but as, in that poem, the principal adventures are more numerous, and the scene more widely shifted in the natural course of the action, the dramatic effect is less remarkable.

Contrast of Virgil.

13. Of episodes standing in closer connexion with the main subject, the chief requisites are that they should be suggested by the natural train of the narrative, and not rudely interrupt any important crisis of the principal action. With these conditions, they may, without detriment to epic unity, be prolonged to a far greater extent than those of the other more independant class. The longest episodes of this description in the Iliad are the "Doloneа" (expedition of Diomed and Ulysses), and the Funeral Games. The excellence of the Greek poet's art will here best appear from a comparison with parallel cases in the most admired epic poem of after ages. It has been already remarked, how naturally the midnight undertaking of the two Greek warriors suggested itself to the mind of a patriotic bard, to relieve a gloomy interval and cheer the drooping spirits of their countrymen. In the parallel episode of Nisus and Euryalus in the Æneid[3], whatever the individual merits of its composition, the servility of the imitation is unrelieved by any such epic pro-

[1] Conf. xv. 405., xvi. 1. [2] xvi. 341—452. [3] ix. 167.

priety. It not only forces unexpectedly into primary importance two hitherto unknown personages, but engages them in an adventure as devoid of all influence on the general action as abortive in its own object. Attention has also above been drawn to the poetical propriety, or even necessity, of the funeral honours bestowed by Achilles on Patroclus. The fulfilment of this sacred duty had, ever since the death of his friend, been among the thoughts uppermost in the hero's mind. It had been solemnly promised to the shade of Patroclus in their midnight interview. Here too nothing is interrupted or interfered with. Victory was restored to the Grecian arms. The Trojans were confined trembling within their city walls. The entire action was lodged in gloomy suspense in the hands of Achilles, for the express object of condensing our whole interest on the burning pile of his friend. In the borrowed episode of the Æneid[1], the violation of all the rules of propriety is as palpable as their observance in the Iliad. Æneas, released from the obstacles interposed by Dido to his expedition, sails under divine auspices direct for Italy. But, while we are anxiously looking for his arrival at this all important scene of the main action, a storm is suddenly raised and drives him back to Sicily; and for what purpose? To perform the obsequies of Anchises, who had died there a year before on the previous passage of the fleet. This most important duty had, therefore, been neglected at the proper time by his "pious" son, to whom it would, even now, never have occurred but for the accident of the storm. There could hardly be a more unseasonable interruption of the main stream

[1] Book v.

of the narrative, or a less justifiable addition to the author's stock of plagiarisms from his Hellenic original. These remarks apply, with even greater force, to the other pair of parallel episodes in the two poems, descriptive of the armour presented to the hero of each by their respective mothers. The arms of Achilles, the gift of the gods to his father, had been lost, ignominiously stripped from the corpse of Patroclus by Hector. This was the event which, next to the death of his friend, most deeply affected the hero, while it also deprived him of the power of exacting vengeance till the deficiency was supplied. Thetis therefore most opportunely steps in to procure him another suit; and of this occasion the poet avails himself to introduce a masterpiece of brilliant description. In the Æneid[1], the hero has lost no arms. He is still in possession of those with which he had engaged Achilles on the field of Troy, and cut his way through the Greek host on the last fatal night of the city, and which were therefore surely equal to cope with Turnus on the banks of the Tiber. There is consequently no pretext whatever for his mother's officious proposal to procure him a fresh suit. The impropriety and superfluity of this excrescence on the correct and elaborate Æneid have been, strange to say, contrasted with the aptness and elegance of the "Shield of Achilles," by the same critics[2] who are most strenuous in stigmatising that beautiful episode as a spurious supplement, on the ground of its incongruity with the main action of the Iliad.

[1] VIII. 370.

[2] Heyn. not. et Excurs. ad loc.; conf. Observ. ad Il. vol. VII. p. 518. sq.

CHAP. VII.

HOMER. CHARACTERS OF THE ILIAD.

1. SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS ON THE CHARACTER OF ACHILLES. — 2. HIS ORATORY. DEPUTATION OF AGAMEMNON. — 3. CONSISTENCY IN THE DETAILS OF HOMER'S DELINEATION. — 4. CHARACTER OF AGAMEMNON. — 5. HIS ORATORY. ATÉ. — 6. CHARACTER OF DIOMED. — 7. HIS ORATORY. — 8. CHARACTER OF MENELAUS. PARALLEL OF THE ODYSSEY. — 9. CHARACTER OF NESTOR. — 10. HIS ORATORY. — 11. CHARACTER OF AJAX. — 12. HIS ORATORY. — 13. DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF GREEK AND TROJAN NATIONAL CHARACTER. — 14. CHARACTER OF PRIAM. ITS DEFECTS. — 15. ITS VIRTUES. — 16. CHARACTER OF HECTOR. — 17. HIS ORATORY. — 18. CHARACTER OF ÆNEAS. — 19. CHARACTER OF HECUBA. FUNERAL DIRGE OF HECTOR. — 20. CHARACTERS OF PARIS AND HELEN.

Supplementary remarks on the character of Achilles.

1. CONSISTENTLY with the general plan of this analysis the object of the present chapter is twofold; to illustrate the characters of the Iliad, and, through them, the origin of the work in which they are delineated. It is proposed therefore first to offer a concise sketch of the character of each hero, as exhibited in his general conduct, and then to trace its nicer traits of individuality in the dramatic details by which it is shadowed forth.

The heroes who present themselves as chief objects of attention are, on the side of the Greeks, Achilles, Agamemnon, Diomed, Ulysses, Menelaus, Nestor, Ajax; on that of the Trojans, Priam, Hector, Æneas, Paris, with the three heroines, Hecuba, Andromache, Helen.

The general view of the character of Achilles has, for reasons already explained, been embodied in the previous chapter. Among the finer traits of the

portrait, attention will here be chiefly directed to those specimens of his poetical oratory in which the vicissitudes of his mental emotions are most powerfully and graphically displayed. The difficulty which must always attend the efforts of the literary critic to convey to others his own impressions of the more delicate features of peculiarity in the creations of original genius, is greatly relieved in the case of Homer, by the graphic spirit and precision of the touches by which those features are delineated. The eloquence of Achilles is not a mere general expression of ideal heroism. It identifies itself by certain distinct and tangible marks, as the oratory of the one individual Achilles, placed in his mouth by the one individual Homer. The same generosity, the same haughty pride, impetuous ardour, and wayward excitability, already traced in the vicissitudes of his conduct, find vent in equally wayward, often almost incoherent, bursts of eloquence; in abrupt transitions from calm to storm, from tenderness to wrath, bespeaking the corresponding struggles of resentment, remorse, love, hatred, grief, or compassion, in his bosom. Much also of the effect here, as in the poet's other more striking portraits, depends on his management of that peculiar species of epic mechanism which, for want of a better title, may be comprised under the general head of "Homeric commonplace;" where, often unconsciously, but sometimes with evident design, certain emphatic modes of expression are reproduced, the better to mark, or stereotype as it were, corresponding modes of thought or action. This important element of Homer's art will hereafter be more closely considered in treating of his style. Its general nature and value will, however,

sufficiently appear from the examples about to be adduced.

His oratory. Deputation of Agamemnon.

2. It is in his address to Agamemnon's deputation, in the ninth book, that the genius of the hero's eloquence is most vividly displayed. This whole debate is indeed a wonderful specimen of rhetorical as well as poetical power, perhaps the highest effort of Homer's dramatic art. The order and dignity with which it is conducted, the happy allotment to each speaker of his own characteristic tone and style, and the skill with which their respective resources of natural oratory are brought to bear on the momentous question at issue, are all equally admirable. The harangue of Ulysses is distinguished by the persuasive eloquence of the sage, the courtier, and the practised pleader; that of Phœnix is the touching, but somewhat diffuse appeal of the antient guardian to his beloved pupil; while Ajax steps in at the close, cutting short the fruitless negotiation by a blunt expression of sullen resentment at the stern unforgiving temper of their host. The address of Achilles himself is one continued struggle of a proud spirit, to preserve calmness amid a fierce conflict of passions. So long as the train of his discourse is confined to explanation of his own conduct, it maintains a comparatively equable tenor: but no sooner does it involve any closer allusion to the author of his wrong, than his indignation effervesces into sallies of virulent, almost bewildered invective. It is this mixture of calmness and impetuosity, of haughty self-command and fervid agitation, which gives the tone to the whole speech, subdividing it, by successive bursts of excited feeling, into clauses or paragraphs, which, rising in pathos to a sort of climax, again subside into more placid mood, until a fresh recurrence of the former stimulus.

The deputation is received courteously, even affectionately: but neither friendship for its members, nor the abject submission of Agamemnon, can bend the sternness of the hero's purpose. Ulysses, the chief spokesman of the party, obtains a patient hearing. Achilles then, after a gentle taunt at the studied grace of the Ithacan chief's oratory, declares his own intention to speak his mind bluntly and openly, in two remarkable lines which passed into a proverb against every species of duplicity or artifice: 312.

ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν,
ὅς χ' ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ.

As he passes on to stigmatise the weakness and iniquity of Agamemnon's rule, his language becomes agitated to incoherence: 316.

ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν,
μάρνασθαι δηΐοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι νωλεμὲς αἰεί·
ἴση μοῖρα μένοντι καὶ εἰ μάλα τις πολεμίζοι·
ἐν δὲ ἰῇ τιμῇ ἠμὲν κακὸς ἠδὲ καὶ ἐσθλός·
κάτθαν' ὁμῶς ὅ τ' ἀεργὸς ἀνὴρ, ὅτε πολλὰ ἐοργώς. . . .

He next recapitulates, in a more tranquil strain of honest satisfaction, his own disinterested services to the common cause, contrasting them with the eagerness of his laggard commander to appropriate their fruits, under the figure of a parent bird, which fares ill and stints herself in her efforts to provide for her helpless nestlings: 323.

ὡς δ' ὄρνις ἀπτῆσι νεοσσοῖσι προφέρῃσι
μάσταχ' ἑπεί κε λάβῃσι, κακῶς δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλει αὐτῇ,
ὡς καὶ ἐγὼ . . .

This simile offers a fine example of another power-

ful weapon of Homer's poetical rhetoric, the Onomatopœia, or adaptation of the sound of words to their sense. The emphatic expression of scorn in the figure, consists greatly in the succession of low sibilant or lisping syllables in its more prominent metrical cadences.

As the train of ideas again touches on sorer points, the hero's wrath finds vent in a series of abrupt interrogatories, wound up to an electrifying climax of withering sarcasm: 335.

ἐμεῦ δ' ἀπὸ μούνου Ἀχαιῶν
εἵλετ', ἔχει δ' ἄλοχον θυμαρέα· τῇ παριαύων
τερπέσθω! τί δὲ δεῖ πολεμιζέμεναι Τρώεσσιν
Ἀργείους; τί δὲ λαὸν ἀνήγαγεν ἐνθάδ' ἀγείρας
Ἀτρείδης; ἦ οὐχ Ἑλένης ἕνεκ' ἠϋκόμοιο;
ἦ μοῦνοι φιλέουσ' ἀλόχους μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
Ἀτρεῖδαι; . . . .

His injunction to the negotiators faithfully to report his answer to their employer, "who had not dared himself to appear in his presence," brings on another still fiercer sally of broken invective, terminating in a scornful dismissal from his thoughts of so contemptible an object: 372.

αἰὲν ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένος! . . . . . .
. . . . . οὐδ' ἂν ἔτ' αὖτις
ἐξαπάφοιτ' ἐπέεσσιν· ἄλις δέ οἱ! ἀλλὰ ἕκηλος
ἐρρέτω· ἐκ γὰρ εὖ φρένας εἵλετο μητίετα Ζεύς.

From this point his language, resuming and maintaining to the close a more sober and placid tone, is seasoned with moral reflexions on the vanity of life its duration and pursuits, and with allusions to the special fatality of his own destiny, all marked by a simple and impressive melancholy. His final decla-

ration to abide by his previous resolve is couched in calm and friendly, but peremptory terms.

With the above series of passages may be collated his dialogue with Patroclus in the sixteenth book.[1] The same characteristics of his eloquence are there reproduced, in strikingly parallel forms, in the torrent of broken sentences with which he passes in review the disasters of the army, the circumstances of its defeat, the need of his succour, the speedy change it would produce, the folly and shame of Agamemnon, his own triumph. . . . . 67.

οἱ δὲ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης
κεκλίαται, χώρης ὀλίγην ἔτι μοῖραν ἔχοντες,
Ἀργεῖοι· Τρώων δὲ πόλις ἐπὶ πᾶσα βέβηκε
θάρσυνος· οὐ γὰρ ἐμῆς κόρυθος λεύσσουσι μέτωπον
ἐγγύθι λαμπομένης· τάχα κεν φεύγοντες ἐναύλους
πλήσειαν νεκύων. . . . .

Consistency in the details of Homer's delineation.

3. Leaving the reader to trace for himself, in the other transactions where Achilles takes the lead, the same consistent adaptation of his oratory to his character, we shall close these extracts with a series of parallel passages, evincing in a singularly pointed

[1] Were we disposed to condemn any portion of the Iliad as rhapsodical interpolation, on the mere ground, in most instances so fallacious, of discrepancy of fact, it would probably be vv. 84—86. of this otherwise brilliant passage. They are not only, in their literal sense, inconsistent with the transactions in B. IX., but, in the existing context, quite unmeaning. For what conceivable reason was there why the Greeks should be willing to restore Briseïs after the relief of the camp by Patroclus, if they had not been willing to purchase the same relief by the same concession in their previous desperate extremity? Strike out these three lines, and vv. 83. and 87. are in perfect harmony. Here again, it seems probable that some primitive rhapsodist, chiefly conversant with this subdivision of the poem, has thought fit to complete his own idea of the hero's present position, by adding the three senseless lines in question.

manner the systematic, though probably unconscious unity, with which the poet is wont to individualise his portraits. The texts in question are, where the hero, when tempted to enlarge on any sore subject, such as his own injuries, errors, griefs, suddenly breaks off and dismisses it, as if fearful of being betrayed into some exhibition of unmanly or querulous irritation. According to the courtesy of Homeric art already referred to, this abrupt dropping of the subject is expressed by the same or a closely similar form of words, recurring in each case in so easy and spontaneous a manner, that they have never attracted the attention of a single critic, in illustration of the genius either of the hero or of the poem. The first example is from his address to Patroclus, vindicating his conduct against the charge of unreasonable implacability: XVI. 52.

ἀλλὰ τόδ' αἰνὸν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἱκάνει· . .
κούρην, ἣν ἄρα μοι γέρας ἔξελον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν, ...
τὴν αὖψ ἐκ χειρῶν ἕλετο κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων . . . .
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι ἐάσομεν. . . .

The next is from his dialogue with Thetis, when agonised by remorse: XVIII. 107.

ὡς ἔρις ἔκ τε θεῶν ἔκ τ' ἀνθρώπων ἀπόλοιτο,
καὶ χόλος, ὅς τ' ἐφέηκε πολύφρονά περ χαλεπῆναι, .
ὡς ἐμὲ νῦν ἐχόλωσεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων. . . .
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοί
περ,
θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον δαμάσαντες ἀνάγκῃ.

A third is in his reconciliation with Agamemnon: XIX. 56.

Ἀτρεΐδη, ἦ ἄρ τι τόδ' ἀμφοτέροισιν ἄρειον
ἔπλετο, σοὶ καὶ ἐμοί, ὅτε νῶϊ περ ἀχνυμένω κῆρ

θυμοβόρῳ ἔριδι μενεήναμεν εἵνεκα κούρης. . . . .
ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοί περ,
θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλον δαμάσαντες ἀνάγκῃ.

A fourth is in his consolatory address to Priam: XXIV. 519.

πῶς ἔτλης ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν ἐλθέμεν οἷος
ἀνδρὸς ἐς ὀφθαλμούς, ὅς τοι πολέας τε καὶ ἐσθλοὺς
υἱέας ἐξενάριξα; σιδήρειόν νύ τοι ἦτορ!
ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ κατ' ἄρ' ἕζευ ἐπὶ θρόνου, ἄλγεα δ' ἔμπης
ἐν θυμῷ κατακεῖσθαι ἐάσομεν, ἀχνύμενοί περ. .

Not only is this expressive formula appropriated, under its several varieties, throughout the twenty-four books of the Iliad, to Achilles alone, but the untranslatable phrase προτετύχθαι, in which its value so greatly consists, is limited to the above passages alone, in the poet's works or in the Greek language.

Similar in spirit is the scornful interruption of his invective against Agamemnon in the text already quoted: IX. 376.

ἅλις δέ οἱ! ἀλλὰ ἕκηλος
ἐρρέτω· ἐκ γὰρ εὖ φρένας, κ.τ.λ.[1]

Attention must also be directed to the consistent propriety of the imagery employed in the embellish-

[1] Further illustration of Homer's deep insight into human nature, and of his fine tact in exhibiting in words the waywardness of a proud but generous temper, may be derived from the parallel of a late illustrious British poet, among whose eccentricities this same haughty petulance was one of the most conspicuous. The works of Byron, where involving allusion to the vicissitudes of his own destiny, offer examples of this abrupt dismissal of sore subjects, so similar, both in spirit and expression, to the passages above cited, as almost to appear paraphrases of the words of Achilles. See Childe Harold, canto IV. stanzas 7. 52. 133. 164.; conf. III. 46.

ment of the hero's portrait. Recourse has here been had alone or chiefly to the higher phenomena of the heavens, and other grand or terrible objects. His sudden appearance, alone and unarmed, on the rampart, routing the Trojans by his simple war shout, is compared, in one of the finest descriptions of the poem, to a column of smoke ascending from a beacon fire, lighted as a signal of distress on a distant island assailed by hostile fleets: XVIII. 205.

ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ κεφαλῇ νέφος ἔστεφε δῖα θεάων
χρύσεον, ἐκ δ' αὐτοῦ δαῖε φλόγα παμφανόωσαν.
ὡς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν ἐξ ἄστεος αἰθέρ' ἵκηται,[1]
τηλόθεν ἐκ νήσου τὴν δῃΐοι ἀμφιμάχονται, ...
ὣς ἀπ' Ἀχιλλῆος κεφαλῆς σέλας αἰθέρ' ἵκανεν.

Similar is the comparison of the terror which his appearance on the field spreads through the Trojan lines, to the smoke of a burning city. The parallel between the two texts is here as remarkable in the expression as in the spirit: XXI. 522.

ὡς δ' ὅτε καπνὸς ἰὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἱκάνει
ἄστεος αἰθομένοιο. . . .

As seen by Priam, hot in pursuit of Hector and the

[1] For this verse Wolf would prefer the reading transmitted by an old commentator, as approved by Aristarchus:

Ὡς δ' ὅτε πῦρ ἐπὶ πόντον ἀριπρεπὲς αἰθέρ' ἵκηται.

The change, even in the face of so high authority, must be pronounced fatal to the value of the passage. It would not only exclude one of the noblest parts of the figure, but destroy the aptness of the simile. Pallas had enveloped the hero's head in a cloud, beautifully figured by the beacon column of smoke, out of which the flame rises. In the reading of Aristarchus the cloud disappears altogether. The metre in the genuine text is also, according to Homer's custom, finely adapted by its sonorous roundness to the grandeur of the object described, a merit to which the hurried succession of dactyls in the proposed alteration has no claim whatever.

routed Trojan host, his destructive ardour and the splendour of his appearance are jointly illustrated, in a passage of singular beauty, by the brilliant but noxious dogstar.[1] On other occasions the lustre of his person, on going forth fully equipped to battle, is likened to that of the rising sun.

Of the circumstances which unite to make up the sublimity of the Iliad, one of the most effective is the vicinity of the scene of action to the sea. In no case has the poet turned this advantage to happier account, than in the connexion established between that grandest of natural objects and the grandest of his own creations. Achilles, after his altercation with Atrides, retiring to nurse his indignation in solitude, "sits alone on the beach, looking across the dark blue sea."[2] The sea-shore is the scene of his touching interview with the shade of his friend[3], when, after wandering restless the night long mourning his bereavement, he lies down oppressed with fatigue, and slumbers on the beach. In the ensuing solemn dedication to Patroclus of the locks formerly destined for his native river Spercheüs, he utters his vow, "looking across the dark blue ocean."[4] Again when, after his revenge is satiated, grief and remorse once more predominate in his breast, starting from his troubled sleep he wanders disconsolate on the shore.[5] His summons to the winds to hasten across the Thracian sea, and fan the sluggish flame of the funeral pile of his friend, while he watches the midnight progress of the consuming element, is another sublime trait of mythological imagery.[6]

[1] xxii. 26. [2] i. 349. [3] xxiii. 59.
[4] xxiii. 143. [5] xxiv. 12. [6] xxiii. 192. sqq.

The illustrations with which he seasons his own eloquence are marked by the same features of dignity and solemnity. Those of the historical class more especially, are derived from objects of deep national interest or of remote mythical antiquity. Such are, in his address to Agamemnon's deputation, the allusions to the power, wealth, and splendour of the Egyptian Thebes, the Pythian sanctuary, or the Minyean Orchomenus; such, on other occasions, his appeals to the dreary but venerable Pelasgic shrine of Dodona[1]; to the war in heaven, the hundred-handed Briareus[2], and to the melancholy and mysterious fate of Niobe and her children.[3]

AGAMEMNON.

Character of Agamemnon.

4. The character of Agamemnon, inferior as it is both in moral and poetical dignity, affords a no less signal example of the poet's skill in this department of his art than the ideal excellence of Achilles. The chief of the Pelopidæ belongs to that not uncommon class of persons in whom good and evil, strength and weakness, are so curiously blended, that their conduct seems to depend, as much or more on the external influences to which they may be exposed, than on their own judgement. Chief of the most powerful family of Hellenic princes, and commander of the confederate force in a great national enterprise; of royal presence, valiant, and skilled in the art of war, he possessed many of the requisites for the fulfilment of his high duties. A patriotic anxiety for the welfare of his army is also habitually uppermost in his breast. But without firmness of purpose or steady principle, easily elated by good or cast down by

[1] xvi. 233. [2] i. 396. sqq. [3] xxiv. 602. sqq.

adverse fortune, he is misled by the caprice of either state of mind into actions, the folly or wickedness of which, on the first revulsion of feeling, he is himself the foremost to acknowledge and lament.

At the commencement of the poem, the extremity to which Troy was reduced, with the subjection of the surrounding country, placed him in the position of a conqueror at the head of a victorious army. In the transactions of the first book accordingly, he appears a vain-glorious man, deaf to every consideration but his own personal dignity and enjoyment. Hence his outrageous treatment of the venerable priest and afflicted parent, and his unmanly attack on the augur Calchas, each for presuming to interfere with his objects of sensual indulgence. In the subsequent altercation with Achilles, whatever his defects of temper or policy, there is, as has been seen, much to palliate or even justify his conduct. In the sequel, acting under the authority of Jupiter, he convenes his councils, and prepares for the renewal of hostilities, with becoming dignity: but on the unexpected result of his trial of the temper of his troops, he is bewildered and powerless; and to prevent the complete disorganisation of the host required the energy and presence of mind of Ulysses. In the field, down to the disastrous termination of the second great battle, his bearing is that of the brave and experienced general: but with his rapid reverse of fortune despair as rapidly succeeds to confidence. During the afflicting scenes that follow, our sympathy with his patriotic anxiety for the national weal is more than counterbalanced by contempt for his abject humiliation to the lately contemned Myrmidon chief, and for his

dastardly proposal of flight, checked by the spirited remonstrance of Diomed.[1]

His oratory. Atë.

5. The oratory of Agamemnon is replete, like that of Achilles, with idiomatic touches vividly expressive of his dominant peculiarities. The folly of his first childish ebullition of offended royalty against the prophet Calchas, for simply declaring the cause of the pestilence, stands self-convicted by his own subsequent admission that the augur was right, implied in his offer to deliver up the damsel. Like the pampered patient, he swallows the nauseous drug but vents his rage on the vial that contained it. Nor can there be a livelier picture of the effect of a desperate reverse of fortune on the mind of a vacillating and despondent commander, than his conversation with Nestor on the night after his first defeat: x. 91.

πλάζομαι ὥδ', ἐπεὶ οὔ μοι ἐπ' ὄμμασι νήδυμος ὕπνος
ἰζάνει, ἀλλὰ μέλει πόλεμος καὶ κήδε' Ἀχαιῶν·
αἰνῶς γὰρ Δαναῶν περιδείδια· οὐδέ μοι ἦτορ
ἔμπεδον· ἀλλ' ἀλαλύκτημαι, κραδίη δέ μοι ἔξω
στηθέων ἐκθρώσκει· τρομέει δ' ὕπο φαίδιμα γυῖα.

Here however, as in the case of Achilles, the most striking illustration of unity of poetical conception consists in a series of parallel passages, offering similar evidence of Homer's peculiar mode of employing the mechanical element of his art to individualise the portraits of his heroes. Agamemnon has just been described as a man not devoid of talent or generosity, but of ill-regulated mind, liable to be hurried by the impulse of the moment into actions, to the folly or crime of which he is keenly alive in hours of reflexion and repentance. This joint as-

[1] ix. 27. sqq.

cendancy of the weak and wicked element of our nature is expressed in Homer's vocabulary by the term Atë, and personified under that title as a female deity. The phrase denotes, in its narrower sense, Evil or Sin, combined with mental delusion, but admits of a variety of significations, according to the degree in which those fundamental ideas may be modified. Sometimes it indicates calamity produced by crime or folly; sometimes vice or delusion without reference to their consequences. As a member of the poetical Pantheon, Atë is the Evil genius, satan, or tempter, by whom men, or even gods, are seduced into actions involving future shame and remorse. She is, in fact, a type of the prominent failing of Agamemnon's character. Accordingly, out of about thirty occasions in which the term occurs in the Iliad, it has been used no less than twenty-four with especial reference to his conduct, while of the remaining examples it has been but rarely, and quite incidentally, connected with the name of any other person or object.[1] The greater proportion of cases are in the hero's own appeals to the power of the demon in palliation of his errors, according to the practice, so familiar with Homer's warriors, of fastening the blame of their own misconduct on their objects of superstitious worship.

[1] In connexion with Agamemnon or his affairs, the phrase occurs as a noun, in I. 412., II. 111., VIII. 237., IX. 18. 115. 504, 505. 512., XVI. 274., XIX. 88. 91. 126. 129. 136. 270.: as a verb, in VIII. 237., IX. 116. 119., XIX. 91. 95. 113. 129. 136. In the remaining examples it is used, twice with reference to the rash valour of Patroclus, XVI. 685. 805., as the cause of his death; once in each case respectively, to characterise the folly, delusion, or vice, of five other persons: Helen, VI. 356.; Paris, XXIV. 28.; Phœnix, IX. 537.; Dolon, X. 391.; Agastrophus, XI. 340.; and once in a general sense, XXIV. 480.

The first example is in the supplication of Achilles to his mother to intercede with Jove to avenge his cause, in order "that Agamemnon may be made to rue:" I. 412.

ἣν ἄτην ὅτ' ἄριστον Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἔτισεν.

These lines again occur in the address of Patroclus to the Myrmidons in the sixteenth book.

In his own harangue to the host, immediately after the quarrel, Atrides attributes the delayed fulfilment of his hopes to the combined influence of Jove and Atë: II. 111.

Ζεύς με μέγα Κρονίδης ἄτῃ ἐνέδησε βαρείῃ. . .

In the eighth book he imputes to the same cause the ill success of his arms: VIII. 236.

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ ῥά τιν' ἤδη ὑπερμενέων βασιλήων
τῇ δ' ἄτῃ ἄασας;

In the council convened after his first defeat, he renews his former complaint in similar terms: and, on Nestor's assigning his late treatment of Achilles as the cause of the national calamity, he exclaims, in a piteous tone of querulous dejection: IX. 115.

ὦ γέρον, οὔ τι ψεῦδος ἐμὰς ἄτας κατέλεξας·
ἀασάμην, οὐδ' αὐτὸς ἀναίνομαι· . . . .
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην, φρεσὶ λευγαλέῃσι πιθήσας,
ἂψ ἐθέλω ἀρέσαι. . .

Phœnix, in his intercession for him with Achilles, palliates his errors and reproves the obduracy of the Myrmidon chief, in a beautiful allegory, worthy even of the pure genius of Christian philosophy. The power of Sin on the human mind is figured by "the swift and impetuous Atë, outstripping her attendant

goddesses of Atonement, who, though feeble, decrepid, and squalid, are yet able and ready, when invoked, to heal the wounds inflicted by their terrible precursor:" IX. 502.

καὶ γάρ τε Λιταί εἰσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο,
χωλαί τε, ῥυσαί τε, παραβλῶπές τ' ὀφθαλμώ·
αἵ ῥά τε καὶ μετόπισθ' Ἄτης ἀλέγουσι κιοῦσαι.
ἡ δ' Ἄτη σθεναρή τε καὶ ἀρτίπος. . . .

But the most curious passage of the series is in Agamemnon's apologetic address to Achilles, on their final reconciliation. His only excuse for his conduct is an appeal to the irresistible power of Atë, as exercised on the destinies of Jove himself, and to the parallel between his own case and that of the king of Olympus: XIX. 134.

ὡς καὶ ἐγὼν, ...
οὐ δυνάμην λελαθέσθ' ἄτης ἧ πρῶτον ἀάσθην.
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ἀασάμην, καί μευ φρένας ἐξέλετο Ζεύς,
ἄψ ἐθέλω ἀρέσαι[1] . . . .

Nor can there be a more spirited contrast than the contemptuous, though courteous brevity of the Myrmidon hero's reply to this long-winded harangue of his crest-fallen commander. In the sequel, however, Achilles admits the reasonableness of Agamemnon's proposal to place the whole blame to the joint account of Jupiter and Atë: XIX. 270.

Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ μεγάλας ἄτας ἄνδρεσσι δίδοισθα!

Here, as in regard to the προτετύχθαι ἐάσομεν of Achilles, the question occurs: whether such consistent unity in the delineation, by so very delicate a

[1] The parallel in IX. 119. sq. above cited is here worthy of notice.

process, of so very peculiar a character, can reasonably be ascribed to more than a single artist?

From the epoch when Achilles reappears on the stage, Agamemnon falls back among the secondary actors of the poem. Of the more amiable features of his character the most prominent is his warm brotherly affection for Menelaus, to which attention will be directed in our notice of that hero.

DIOMED.

Character of Diomed.

6. Among the warriors of the Iliad, Diomed is the one who in general excellence ranks nearest to Achilles, or even in some respects may be said to surpass him. The character of Tydides is not indeed marked by the grander features, moral or physical, which distinguish the Thessalian chief: but if there is less to awaken admiration or awe, there is more to conciliate esteem. As Achilles is the type of ideal heroism, Diomed is that of military virtue. He may, indeed, be pronounced a blameless specimen of the Greek warrior; and, hence a singular merit in the delineation of his portrait, is the tact of the poet in imparting to it such traits of individuality, as to exclude the insipidity commonly attaching to irreproachable excellence in heroes of chivalry. Diomed is the youngest of the seven leading chiefs; and his most prominent feature, next to the energy of his bearing, is its modesty. With a habitual deference to the maturer judgement of his colleagues, he is yet always ready, with manly frankness, to assert his opinion where duty requires. Hence he is usually put forward when any alarming crisis calls for prompt and bold decision. During the absence of Achilles he is the soul of every martial achievement,

until forced by wounds to retire from the field. Conjointly with Ulysses, he is the special favourite of Minerva. They are the two heroes who unite, in the amplest degree, the qualities of which she was the patroness, valour, discretion, and enterprise. In every encounter, whether against men or gods, Diomed under her auspices is successful. He discomfits not only Hector and Æneas, the former on two occasions, but Mars himself, and is never worsted or repulsed but by divine interference. When causelessly rebuked by Agamemnon for an apparent want of martial zeal, he listens in respectful silence; and reprimands his esquire for presuming to retort on the commander in chief.[1] His justification is better secured by the brilliant lead taken by him in the ensuing combat. In the sequel, as the critical turns of fortune demand prowess in the field or vigour in the council, the services of Diomed seldom fail to be called into request. In the seventh book[2], when the prolonged silence of the elder chiefs implies an acquiescence in the dishonourable terms of peace proposed by Priam, Diomed, by a single pithy remonstrance, insures their immediate rejection. In the disastrous flight of the Greeks in the following battle[3], when a "divine panic" spreads through the lines, extending even to Ajax, Ulysses, and the Atridæ, Diomed, alone exempt from its influence, remains to succour the aged Nestor, nor can his efforts to stem the torrent of the victorious enemy be restrained but by the irresistible arms of Jupiter. When, after the fatal issue of the same battle, Agamemnon's proposal to abandon the war appears to meet with the tacit approval of his fellow-chiefs[4], Diomed, after again vainly

[1] IV. 401. sqq. [2] 398. [3] VIII. 78. sqq. [4] IX. 29.

waiting till some more aged councillor should have risen, respectfully but resolutely condemns the dastardly suggestion. On hearing the result of the mission to Achilles, again a gloomy despondency paralyses the assembly; again Diomed, after the customary pause, denounces their pusillanimous dependance on the arm of a single warrior instead of their own valour. When Nestor proposes the midnight expedition to the Trojan camp, the young hero as usual modestly holds back, to give place to some more experienced warrior, before devoting himself to the hazardous enterprise.

His oratory.

7. The language of Diomed is in strict keeping with his character, brief, simple, and decided. He never takes part in the debate but when the judgement of his elders is at fault. He then speaks concisely and to the point. Among the heroes of the Iliad there is none, not even Ajax, who does so much and says so little. His qualities therefore, as an orator, are shadowed forth as much in the circumstances by which he is induced to speak, as in his own eloquence. Even here however the poet has managed, through his favourite epic mechanism, strikingly to individualise the style of that cloquence, by certain characteristic turns of expression, slightly varied for the occasion, but limited to Diomed alone. The first example occurs after the humiliating proposal of peace by the Trojan herald: VII. 398.

ὣς ἔφαθ'· οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ.
ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·
μήτ' ἄρ τις νῦν κτήματ' Ἀλεξάνδροιο δεχέσθω, ...
ὣς ἔφαθ'· οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπίαχον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο.

The next is after Agamemnon's suggestion of flight: IX. 29—50.

ὣς ἔφαθ' · οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
δὴν δ' ἀνέω ἦσαν τετιηότες υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·
Ἀτρεΐδη, σοὶ πρῶτα μαχήσομαι ἀφραδέοντι, . . .
ὣς ἔφαθ' · οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπίαχον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο.

A third is after the failure of the mission to Achilles: IX. 693—710.

ὣς ἔφαθ' · οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
δὴν δ' ἀνέω ἦσαν τετιηότες υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·
Ἀτρεΐδη, κύδιστε, ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον,
μὴ ὄφελες λίσσεσθαι ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα, ...
ὣς ἔφαθ' · οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἐπῄνησαν βασιλῆες,
μῦθον ἀγασσάμενοι Διομήδεος ἱπποδάμοιο.

A fourth is after Nestor's proposal of the midnight expedition to the Trojan camp: X. 218.

ὣς ἔφαθ' · οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ,
τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·
Νέστορ, ἔμ' ὀτρύνει κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ . . .
ὣς ἔφαθ' · οἱ δ' ἔθελον Διομήδεϊ πολλοὶ ἕπεσθαι.

In each case a dilemna, a pause, a silence; Diomed steps forward, by a few concise remarks restores confidence, and his views are applauded and adopted.[1]

The δὴν δ' ἀνέω ἦσαν, and the ὀψὲ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε, under their occasional varieties, are here as exclusively characteristic of Diomed, as the ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν προτετύχθαι ἐάσομεν is of Achilles, or the Ἄτη of Agamemnon.

[1] Conf. XIV. 103. sqq.

On the reappearance of Achilles, Diomed, with every other hero put forward in the absence of the protagonist, falls into the background. In the games however he maintains, under the auspices of his patroness Minerva, his superiority over every competitor in gymnastic achievement.

Any remarks on the character of Ulysses, the hero who next in point of importance would demand attention, will be reserved for the analysis of the Odyssey. In that poem he acts the part of Protagonist. To it consequently we must look for his entire portrait, of which his appearances in the Iliad are but supplementary touches. In the following case it will be proper to reverse this order, and complete the picture presented in the Iliad, by the additional traits derived from the Odyssey.

MENELAUS.

Character of Menelaus.

8. Menelaus unites, but on a smaller scale, the valour, modesty, and discretion of Diomed, with the milder virtues of Patroclus, and with a quickness of temper and warmth of feeling peculiar to himself. Although described as inferior in the aggregate of his warlike accomplishments to the other leading chiefs[1], he yields to none in courage or adventurous spirit. But the animating principle of his conduct, which gives the tone to his whole character, is gratitude to his fellow-countrymen for their exertions in his cause, with a painful sense of the calamities which they were doomed to suffer for his sake. Towards Agamemnon these sentiments, combined with fraternal love and veneration for his high rank and office, produce a devoted attachment to his person,

[1] VII. 104. sq., X. 237. sqq.

and unqualified deference to his will. Nor is Agamemnon less conspicuous for brotherly affection. This reciprocal feeling forms one of the most agreeable features in the character of each, and has furnished the poet with many lively and pathetic scenes.

The first appearance of Menelaus is in his duel with Paris. His joyful eagerness for the combat is here ascribed by himself, rather to the prospect it offers of terminating the privations of his friends, than even to his desire of avenging his injuries or asserting his rights: III. 97.

μάλιστα γὰρ ἄλγος ἰκάνει
θυμὸν ἐμόν· φρονέω δὲ διακρινθήμεναι ἤδη
Ἀργείους καὶ Τρῶας· ἐπεὶ κακὰ πολλὰ πέποσθε
εἵνεκ' ἐμῆς ἔριδος. . . . .

In the disastrous night of the Doloneа the welfare of those friends is still uppermost in his thoughts: X. 25.

ὣς δ' αὔτως Μενέλαον ἔχε τρόμος· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτῷ
ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἐφίζανε, μή τι πάθοιεν
Ἀργεῖοι, τοὶ δὴ ἕθεν εἵνεκα πουλὺν ἐφ' ὑγρὴν . . . .

The brotherly affection of Agamemnon is touchingly displayed in the adventure of the fourth book, when, supposing his brother's life in danger from the wound of Pandarus, with his characteristic despondency and self-reproach he blames himself as the cause of the fatality: IV. 155—169.

φίλε κασίγνητε, θάνατόν νύ τοι ὅρκι' ἔταμνον,
οἷον προστήσας πρὸ Ἀχαιῶν Τρῶσι μάχεσθαι. . . . .
ἀλλά μοι αἰνὸν ἄχος σέθεν ἔσσεται, ὦ Μενέλαε,
αἴ κε θάνῃς, ...
καί κεν ἐλέγχιστος πολυδίψιον Ἄργος ἱκοίμην. . . .

The fraternal tenderness of Agamemnon is also

beautifully expressed in his anxiety lest, in compliment to his own royal dignity, Menelaus, though inferior in martial accomplishment to many other chiefs, should be selected by Diomed as the comrade of his midnight adventure.[1]

The dauntless valour of Menelaus, and his sensitive keenness of temper, are jointly displayed in his forwardness to accept the challenge of Hector; his modesty and good sense are no less conspicuous in his ready submission to Agamemnon, who, anxious as well for his brother's safety as the credit of the Greek arms, urges him to resign the dangerous honour into abler hands.[2] On the gloomy night after the second day's battle, the Spartan chief, roused from his sleep by sympathy with his brother's disquietude, and anxiety to share his labours and distresses, rises and hastens to his side.[3] When Nestor, therefore, taxes Menelaus with a slackness to support Agamemnon[4] in his arduous duties, the latter warmly defends him from the groundless charge, attributing even his errors to over-regard for his own imperial person and authority.

After the death of Patroclus, Menelaus takes the lead in the field, stimulated by a powerful combination of influences, grief for the loss and gratitude for the services of so generous a supporter of his cause, and a sense of the peculiar shame that would attach to himself should the body of his benefactor remain in the hands of the enemy.[5] Inspired by these feelings, he signalises himself so much beyond his apparent powers, as to have obtained for this portion of the poem the title of Prowess of Menelaus.

[1] x. 240.; conf. 408. sqq., III. 213., XVII. 587. [2] VII. 94—120.
[3] x. 25. [4] x. 114—120. sqq. [5] XVII. 1. sqq. 92. 564. 671.

The brilliancy of his conduct secures him the patronage of Minerva, and the spirit with which she animates him is illustrated by a figure singularly adapted to his character and person. He is compared to a fly, the emblem of boldness and activity apart from physical strength, which, when repeatedly driven off by superior force, still nimbly returns nothing daunted to the attack: XVII. 571.

ἥτε καὶ ἐργομένη μάλα περ χροὸς ἀνδρομέοιο
ἰσχανάᾳ δακέειν. . . .

In the chariot race with Antilochus, his generous sense of gratitude again appears, in his reasons for the frank concession of his acknowledged prize to his young comrade: XXIII. 606.

οὐ γάρ κέν με τάχ᾽ ἄλλος ἀνὴρ παρέπεισεν Ἀχαιῶν·
ἀλλὰ σὺ γὰρ δὴ πόλλ᾽ ʼπαθες καὶ πόλλ᾽ ἐμόγησας,
σός τε πατὴρ ἀγαθὸς, καὶ ἀδελφεὸς, εἵνεκ᾽ ἐμεῖο. . .

Parallel of the Odyssey.

In the Odyssey these characteristics are sustained with a simple unstudied consistency, which speaks powerfully in favour of the common authorship of the two poems. The same lively gratitude towards his companions in arms maintains its ascendant in his declining years, tempered by melancholy reflexions on the many that had perished, and on the disasters still endured by others for his sake. His warm affection for Agamemnon is now chastened by grief for his death, which his own capricious fortune had deprived him of the power either to avert or avenge; a grief embittered by the thought, that the day of their parting had witnessed the only recorded dissension between them.[1] Hence the surprise expressed by

[1] Od. IV. 538., III. 136.

Telemachus to Nestor, on hearing of the fate of Agamemnon, that Menelaus should not have appeared either as his defender or avenger: Od. III. 249.

ποῦ Μενέλαος ἔην; . . .
ἦ οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν Ἀχαϊκοῦ; ἀλλά πη ἄλλῃ
πλάζετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους;

In the sequel when the same Telemachus, as the guest of Menelaus, admires the splendour of the Spartan palace, its proprietor offers the following simple but eloquent tribute to the memory of his departed friends and brother: Od. IV. 90.

ἕως ἐγὼ περὶ κεῖνα πολὺν βίοτον συναγείρων
ἠλώμην, τείως μοι ἀδελφεὸν ἄλλος ἔπεφνεν . . . .
ὣς οὔτι χαίρων τοῖσδε κτεάτεσσιν ἀνάσσω. . . . .
ὧν ὄφελον, τριτάτην περ ἔχων ἐν δώμασι μοῖραν
ναίειν, οἱ δ' ἄνδρες σόοι ἔμμεναι, οἳ τότ' ὄλοντο
Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ.

With this may be compared the description of the grief which overwhelms him (538.) when his brother's murder is predicted to him by Proteus. The announcement of his Ithacan guest's name elicits another characteristic burst of generous feeling towards an old and dear companion in arms: 169.

ὦ πόποι! ἦ μάλα δὴ φίλου ἀνέρος υἱὸς ἐμὸν δῶ
ἷκεθ', ὃς εἵνεκ' ἐμεῖο πολέας ἐμόγησεν ἀέθλους.
καί μιν ἔφην ἐλθόντα φιλησέμεν ἔξοχον ἄλλων . . . .
καί κέ οἱ Ἄργεϊ νάσσα πόλιν καὶ δώματ' ἔτευξα. . . .

The contrast between the unity and simplicity of the poet's delineation of this beautiful character, and the odious and incongruous features by which it is disfigured in the works of the other representatives of the "common epic genius," will be noticed elsewhere.[1]

[1] Infra, vol. II. p. 128. 309.

NESTOR.

Character of Nestor.

9. The character of the Pylian hero, while from its broader features a more popular specimen perhaps of Homer's art than those hitherto considered, is no less remarkable for delicacy of traits and colouring.

Nestor is the self-satisfied old veteran, dwelling with garrulous complacency on the glories of the past and the degeneracy of the present race of heroes; assuming, as a matter of course, the superiority of his own wisdom and experience to that of the existing generation; omitting no opportunity of fighting his battles over again; and swelling his harangues on these favourite topics with diffuse historical illustrations derived chiefly from his personal achievements. Yet these failings are more than compensated by his good qualities. His pretensions to youthful prowess are well supported by the valour which adorns his old age. He is as fearless, if not as active in the field, as the youngest of his comrades. While inculcating on all occasions his prior claims to deference in council, he arrogates no title to dictate or domineer, and readily appreciates good advice from whatever quarter it may proceed. Indefatigable in his labours for the public good, he is throughout cheerful and good humoured, as free from undue elation as from despondency. Hence, during the whole series of national reverses, the unvarying placidity of the hearty old veteran acts as a sort of counterpoise to the abject humiliation of the commander in chief, and sheds a friendly ray of comfort over the general gloom of the camp.

That his real wisdom did not derogate from his high pretensions is vouched for by the poet's own

testimony to the substantial value of many of his suggestions, as expressed in the following recurring formula:

Νέστωρ οὔ καὶ πρόσθεν ἀρίστη φαίνετο βουλή. . . .

Nestor is in fact, throughout, the presiding genius of the Greek councils. Hence the vision which exhorts Agamemnon to resume martial operations assumes the form of Nestor. The council held for considering the import of that vision is convened at his quarters. In the ensuing assembly he prescribes a mode of marshalling the troops, adopted by Agamemnon. In the duel between Ajax and Hector he is intrusted with the arrangement of the ceremony on the Greek side. In the sequel he proposes the fortification of the camp, and gives the plan for its execution. He urgently inculcates on the troops certain points of military discipline, as valuable in theory as they were little observed in practice.[1] He is the first who ventures to press on Agamemnon the necessity of appeasing Achilles, and selects the commissioners for the management of that delicate affair. On the same anxious night he enjoins the posting of the guard around the camp. The midnight expedition of Diomed and Ulysses also originates in Nestor's suggestion, as does the permission obtained by Patroclus from Achilles to lead forth the Myrmidon troops, on which hinges the whole subsequent fortune of the war.

His oratory.

10. The more characteristic peculiarities of the Pylian chief supply some of the liveliest specimens

[1] That they should not break the order of the phalanx, in their ardour to single out objects of personal encounter; nor attend to the plunder of the slain, until victory was secured over the survivors. IV. 303., VI. 67.

of the sly satirical humour with which the poet seasons even the graver portions of his narrative. The orations of the old hero frequently commence with that common figure of senile rhetoric, an apostrophe to what might be said or thought by others whose opinions were likely to weigh with his audience; as in the following parallel passages:

I. 254. ὦ πόποι! ἦ μέγα πένθος Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν ἱκάνει·
ἦ κεν γηθήσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες,
ἄλλοι τε Τρῶες μέγα κεν κεχαροίατο θυμῷ,
εἰ σφῶϊν τάδε πάντα πυθοίατο μαρναμένοιϊν.

VII. 124. ὦ πόποι! ἦ μέγα πένθος Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν ἱκάνει·
ἦ κε μέγ' οἰμώξειε γέρων ἱππηλάτα Πηλεύς, . .
τοὺς νῦν εἰ πτώσσοντας ὑφ' Ἕκτορι πάντας
ἀκούσαι.

XV. 661. ὦ φίλοι, ἀνέρες ἔστε, καὶ αἰδῶ θέσθ' ἐνὶ θυμῷ
ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων. . . .

Next follows, if the case be one of distress or difficulty, a lamentation over his own decay of vigour, but for which, it is implied, a very different turn might be given to affairs. The justice of these regrets is then enforced by a reference to some heroic adventure, the fortunes of which had hinged on his youthful prowess. This passage usually commences with the following expressive poetical formula:

εἴθ' ὡς ἠβώοιμι, βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη.

These excursions, it is true, may occasionally provoke by their diffuseness: but such is the general spirit of their narrative, and of the sketches they contain of the men and manners of former times, that the reader of the present day is as little disposed as

the poet's own audience to grudge the lively old warrior the full indulgence of his egotistic eloquence.

His first speech[1], in which he attempts to smooth matters between the two angry chiefs, embodies in more concise limits than usual the prominent points of his oratory. He begins by bidding them reflect on what their enemies the Trojans, or their own friends at home, will think; reminds them how much older he is than either of them, and of the deference he deserves at their hands; that his youth had been associated with far better men than they, or than the world had since beheld; by whom he had been specially invited to take part in their glorious exploits, and who had always reverenced his counsels. Yet after asserting these lofty pretensions, he delivers his opinions with a gentle persuasiveness which, combined with their own propriety, usually secures a ready acquiescence.

Among the more satirical touches of the portrait, may be adduced the busy importance with which he tutors the deputation to Achilles at the moment of their departure, as to the proper mode of conducting their negotiation, "especially Ulysses," whose own unassisted discretion in any such case might be presumed at least equal to that of his Pylian Mentor: IX. 180.

δενδίλλων ἐς ἕκαστον, Ὀδυσσῆϊ δὲ μάλιστα,
πειρᾶν ὡς πεπίθοιεν ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα.

The expressive word at the commencement here vividly reflects the bustling activity with which the self-satisfied old sage puts forth to the last moment his prolific stores of advice, nodding and whispering in turn to the members of the commission the suggestions best suited to their respective capacities.

[1] I. 254.

Equally characteristic is the melancholy grandiloquence with which, after some long detail of his youthful exploits, he sums up his reminiscences of the admiration and renown they had procured him: XI. 759.

ἔνθ' ἄνδρα κτείνας πύματον λίπον· . . . . . .
πάντες δ' εὐχετόωντο θεῶν Διΐ, Νέστορί τ' ἀνδρῶν.
ὡς ἔον, εἴ ποτ' ἔον γε, μετ' ἀνδράσιν!

and again: XXIII. 632. sq.

ἔνθ' οὔτις μοι ὁμοῖος ἀνὴρ γένετ', ...
ὥς ποτ' ἔον! νῦν αὖτε νεώτεροι ἀντιόωντων[1]
ἔργων τοιούτων· ἐμὲ δὲ χρὴ γήραϊ λυγρῷ
πείθεσθαι, τότε δ' αὖτε μετέπρεπον ἡρώεσσι!

He consoles himself with the reflexion that he remains at least superior in council to all his contemporaries: IX. 104.

οὐ γάρ τις νόον ἄλλος ἀμείνονα τοῦδε νοήσει,
οἷον ἐγὼ νοέω, ἠμὲν πάλαι ἠδ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν.[2]

A few additional remarks suggested by the reproduction of the Pylian hero's character in the Odyssey will be reserved for the analysis of that poem.

The character of Phœnix, though but a slight sketch, offers, in its correspondence and its contrast, an interesting parallel to that of Nestor. Phœnix is also an aged Mentor, with similar credit in his own sphere for wisdom and persuasive oratory. No less diffuse in his discourse, he is equally fond of seasoning it with the experience of his early days. But the same features are presented under different colours. In Phœnix a grave, even sad composure is substituted for the hearty self-sufficiency of the Pylian chief. His appeals are directed rather to the

[1] Conf. IV. 324. [2] Conf. II. 337.

heart than the judgement. The scope of his episodical illustrations is warning rather than example; they are selected not from the merits, but the errors of his past conduct, and their pernicious consequences. The whole of his expostulatory address to Achilles in the deputation scene, is marked by a mild melancholy suavity of tone and sentiment, finely contrasted with the complacency and good-humoured censoriousness of Nestor's harangues on similar occasions.

AJAX.

Character of Ajax.

11. Ajax is the model of a sturdy man of war, and little or nothing more. With colossal stature and Herculean strength he combines experience of the mechanical part of a soldier's duty, and a large share of that species of courage which consists in a natural insensibility to danger and confidence in his own prowess. His services consist, accordingly, less in brilliant achievement than in stemming the adverse tide of war by his physical force. Hence, although described in general terms[1] as both in personal appearance and valour the champion next in rank to Achilles, and as the warrior on whose exertions the soldiery at large chiefly relied in disastrous emergencies, he is greatly surpassed in the more excellent points of military virtue by other heroes, especially by Diomed. In the games, when successively pitted against that hero, Ulysses, and Polypœtes, in the broadsword, wrestling, and the disk, the efforts of his ponderous strength are in each case baffled by the activity and tact of his antagonists. He is also as susceptible as the meanest soldier, of that superstitious panic[2] which any supposed evil omen is apt

[1] xvii. 279. alibi.

[2] xi. 544. alibi.

to spread through the ranks. Achilles and Diomed are indeed the only heroes entirely exempt from this weakness. It is hence with some consistency that to Ajax is assigned no separate "Aristea," or "Prowess." While frequently described and put forward as the "rampart" or "bulwark"[1] of the host, his services, as indicated by these figures, are of the passive rather than active kind. Here again it is not probably accidental, that while, in order to bring about the Trojan triumph with least possible detriment to the national honour, all the other first rate warriors, Agamemnon, Diomed, and Ulysses, are disabled in the early part of the battle in which Patroclus fell, Ajax is preserved unhurt to stem the advance of the enemy.

Even this, on first view, rude and ordinary character, is tempered with fine shades of moral peculiarity. The innate generosity of the heroic genius, in place of the ardent enthusiasm of Achilles, the energy of Diomed, or the sensitive quickness of Menelaus, is combined in Ajax with a morbid sensibility to personal honour. This feature is observable even in the Iliad, where comparatively little opportunity exists for its display; but is brought out more prominently in the Odyssey, and constitutes the groundwork of his character as reproduced in the tragic drama. Intellectually considered Ajax is the dullest of the heroes. Hence, while his rank and services secure him a seat in the select council of Agamemnon, he is with much propriety excluded from all part in its debates. He owes his appointment as one of the mission to Achilles, less, evidently, to any personal fitness for so delicate an

[1] ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν, passim.

office, than to his character as representative of the sentiments and claims of the mass, or common soldiery of the host.

12. One of the happiest similes in the Iliad is that where Ajax, slowly and sullenly retreating as he attempts alone to stem the advance of the Trojans, is compared to an ass driven from a corn-field by the cudgels of a troop of urchins, and leisurely finishing his meal as he retires amid the blows of his puny assailants.[1] His own character and that of his oratory are jointly shadowed forth in the epithets *βουγάϊος* and *ἀμαρτοεπής*[2], applied to him by Hector, and to him alone throughout the poem. The first jointly expresses his gigantic strength, and the boasting self-confidence in that attribute to which he frequently gives utterance: for Ajax, consistently with the mixture of coarseness and sincerity in his character, was, like various other warriors of better judgment, somewhat of a braggart. Here again may be remarked how nicely the poet has adapted to the genius of his heroes, the language through which each indulges in this propensity. Nothing can be more different than the garrulous complacency of Nestor's self-commendatory harangues, the blustering vain-glory of Hector, and the turgid "who's afraid" simplicity of the few big words in which Ajax expresses his sense of his own prowess. His address to Hector before their single combat may be taken as an example: VII. 196.[3] His oratory.

ἐπεὶ οὔτινα δείδιμεν ἔμπης·
οὐ γάρ τίς με βίῃ γε ἑκὼν ἀέκοντα δίηται,
οὐδὲ μὲν ἰδρείῃ· ἐπεὶ οὐδ' ἐμὲ νήϊδά γ' οὕτως
ἔλπομαι ἐν Σαλαμῖνι γενέσθαι τε τραφέμεν τε!

[1] XI. 558. [2] XIII. 824. [3] Conf. VII. 226., XIII. 76. 810. alibi.

His style of oratory also justifies the other epithet of ἁμαρτοεπής, or "blunderer," ironically bestowed on him by the Trojan chief. His speeches, while brief and blunt, are often deficient both in argument and consistency. In his address to Achilles[1], for example, as a member of Agamemnon's deputation, he commences, with an apparent intention of abruptly closing the debate, by denouncing the heartless obduracy of their host and the fruitlessness of further remonstrance: yet, after laying some stress on the unreasonableness of the hero, who "while deprived of but one mistress refuses a compensation of seven," he winds up in the very tone of supplication which he had just before condemned in his companions. The shorter specimens of his oratory are chiefly exhortations to his men, or prayers for divine aid in critical moments of the combat. The longest concludes with his celebrated supplication to Jupiter to remove the preternatural darkness which shrouded the battle, "that, if doomed to destruction, they might at least have the satisfaction of perishing by daylight."[2] Longinus has overrated this figure, in classing it with the sublimer passages of Homer. It partakes of the character of what, in modern criticism, is called a conceit; though a noble one, no doubt, and marked by that simple species of dignity to be expected in the poetical conceptions of Ajax.

Parallel of the Odyssey.

In order to appreciate the consistent maintenance of this hero's character as reproduced in the Odyssey, we must bear in mind the altered circumstances under which he appears. His presence in the infernal region was the result of his own act of wounded pride, consequent on his defeat by Ulysses in the

[1] IX. 624. [2] XVII. 645.

competition for the arms of Achilles. Suddenly the repose he had sought in this dismal retreat is disturbed by the appearance of his successful opponent in the same human form as at their last fatal parting. In the gloomy sullenness with which he keeps aloof, while the other spirits flock round the adventurous stranger; in the stern silence with which, rejecting his generous rival's conciliatory advances, he stalks away into the darkest recesses of Erebus; the poet has shadowed forth, with singular truth, the mode in which pride, sorrow, and resentment would display themselves in such a character upon such an occasion.[1]

TROJAN CHARACTERS.

Distinctive characteristics of the Greek and Trojan national characters.

13. Before entering on the separate characters of the Trojan heroes, attention must be directed to the broader features of national distinction in the genius of the rival races. In the delineation of these the poet's deep knowledge of mankind is seen extending, from the narrow circle of personal peculiarity, to those more comprehensive varieties of human nature which originate in an equally comprehensive range of physical or historical causes.

Allusion has already been made to certain defects in the character of the Trojans incidentally stigmatised in the Iliad, either by Homer himself or his heroes; to their want of moral principle, to the levity and treachery of their international dealings, to the palpable injustice of their cause, to their obstinacy in upholding it, and to the profligacy of their domestic manners. How far these defects, as compared with the rightful motives, fair dealing, and primitive habits of their adversaries, may be laid to account of Homer's

[1] Od. xi. 543. sqq.

national partialities, how far they may rest on a historical basis, are questions on which it were little profitable to enlarge. The contrast itself may, at least, be considered as shadowing forth certain fundamental features of distinction, which have always been more or less observable between the European and Asiatic races. The state of society in Troy resembles, it is true, in the main, that of Greece at the same period. In each, the patriarchal simplicity on which the social edifice was based is modified, without being altogether superseded, by the refinements of an earlier Eastern civilisation. Among the Trojans, however, the levity and corruption of Asiatic life had encroached on the primitive manners to a greater extent than in Greece; and this excess it is which, in the poet's description, forms the chief moral difference between Greek and Trojan.

The character of the latter nation is graphically portrayed in that of its royal family, as sketched out in the episodical notices occurring in the Iliad, and which prove those distinctive peculiarities to be of no recent date. The Dardanian line of princes is the oldest recorded in Homeric tradition. The order of succession is given in a speech addressed to Achilles by Æneas[1], himself a prince of the blood. As his account is little more than a bare pedigree, it may be presumed that any particulars he furnishes of the adventures of his kinsmen were such as formed their chief title to celebrity. These details accordingly, with those incidentally supplied in other parts of the poem, relate, not to the warlike achievements or bold enterprise of the race, but to their wealth, luxury, gallantry, and the magnificence of their courtly state,

[1] xx. 213. sqq.

or to the calamities consequent on their treachery and impiety. Their moral defects are exhibited, at the same time, in appropriate conjunction with the personal graces which contribute both to the excitement and gratification of sensual appetite. Dardanus, the founder of the dynasty, was son of Jupiter. Erichthonius, son of Dardanus, was the richest monarch of his time, possessing the finest breed of horses, the noblest species of royal wealth in those days. The surpassing beauty of his grandchild Ganymede attracted the notice of Jupiter, who transported the youth to Olympus, to act as his page and cupbearer. Tros the Father of Ganymede, and third sovereign of the line, was, in compensation for the loss of his son, enriched by Jupiter with a still nobler breed of horses than that possessed by Erichthonius.[1] Laomedon nephew of Ganymede, and fifth occupant of the Dardanian throne, surrounded Troy with walls so magnificent as to have been fabled the joint work of Neptune and Apollo. In the same fable, his subsequent impiety towards these deities involved him in a series of calamities, which terminated in the destruction of his city, taken and sacked by Hercules.[2] His elder son Tithonus, distinguished like Ganymede for his beauty, engaged the affections of Aurora, who carried him off and espoused him. Anchises, cousin of Tithonus, was indebted to the same personal charms for the honour of sharing the bed of Venus. Priam, the younger son and successor of Laomedon, if less favoured than some of his kinsmen by the amorous

[1] Il. v. 265.; conf. XXIII. 348.

[2] Il. VII. 452., XXI. 446., v. 640. sqq., XX. 146. Schol. Ven. ad loc. Apollod. II. 5. sqq.

attentions of the goddesses, makes ample amends by the number of mortal concubines who enjoy, in common with the reigning sultana, the honour of his embraces. The paramount authority of his race in the court of love and beauty is further vouched for by the Judgement of Paris, whose subsequent achievement forms an appropriate and fatal conclusion to the catalogue of family crimes and gallantries.

Character of Priam. Its defects.

14. Priam's court and domestic establishment, where the produce of his amours, amounting to fifty sons and twelve daughters, reside with their respective consorts in separate domiciles[1], offer an interesting combination of patriarchal simplicity with Oriental licentiousness. The old king's character is itself a fair type both of the good and evil in that of his nation. With much that is generous in conduct and feeling, and a certain tact in the arts of government, he is signally deficient in that honest principle which alone can secure the welfare of a state. His affectionate heart and domestic virtues are fatally counterbalanced by an over-indulgent temper; and his indifference to, or even sympathy with, the ruling vices of his family involves the ruin of his country. Nor does the political morality of his councillors appear in a better light than his own. The Greeks are described as having, before commencing hostilities, used every effort by negotiation to obtain redress. Upon one of these occasions[2] it was gravely suggested, by a member of the Trojan senate, to murder the ambassadors; and the proposal, though not carried into effect, seems to have been complacently received. How little congenial measures of reparation were to the mass is further implied in the current tradition of later times,

[1] VI. 242. [2] XI. 139.

where Antenor and Æneas, the only Dardanian chiefs who had the merit of disapproving the pernicious policy of their countrymen, are represented as secret partisans of the Greeks.

The poet has, as usual, availed himself almost exclusively of the dramatic mode of portraying this spirit of national levity. In the remarks which the appearance of Helen elicits from the assembled elders on the city ramparts, those venerable personages take pride, rather than shame, in the circumstance of their handsome prince having seduced and transferred to their own city the fairest princess in Europe. The poetical value of this passage, so justly extolled by illustrious critics, does not here immediately concern us: its ethic spirit alone is now in question. These grave representatives of the national wisdom are seated on a tower, looking towards the plain, where the fate of their country was staked on the issue of a single engagement. Suddenly Helen, the guilty cause of their calamities, is seen approaching. What are the reflexions that might be expected to suggest themselves on such an occasion in such quarters? Ought it not to have occurred to these sage councillors the more forcibly, what an iniquitous thing it was, that so many brave men should bite the dust, and whole nations be involved in destruction, for the mere gratification of a pair of frivolous adulterers? But, instead of this they complacently remark, that "it is no wonder the Greeks and Trojans should wage long and bloody wars for the possession of so divine a woman."[1] Equally characteristic is Priam's own language in the immediate sequel, when, calling Helen affectionately to his

[1] III. 155.

side he assures her that "she is no way in fault; that the gods alone are to blame, as the cause of their common affliction."

Another example of the skill with which Homer imposes on his light-headed Dardanian heroes the duty of exposing their own defects, is in the meeting of council[1], where Antenor proposes putting an end to the war by the restoration of Helen and her goods to her rightful husband. He enforces this suggestion by a reference to the fresh crime of treachery and assassination of which the Trojans had been guilty, and to the hopelessness of success in so bad a cause. No one seconds this motion. Paris then, with characteristic effrontery, tells the venerable sage, that "if he is serious in what he says he talks like an idiot;" and declares that he will not part with Helen on any terms, but that, as to the property brought with her from Sparta, they may dispose of it as had been suggested. Priam here interposes, and, without any notice of the advice of Antenor, commends the offer of Paris as fair and conciliatory, and advises a mission to the Greek camp on the subject; which proposal is approved and adopted.

Its virtues.

15. Such, however, are the amiable qualities by which the weaker points of the old king's conduct are relieved, that while we condemn his vices, it is difficult not to admire his general character. It is, in fact, partly in the excess of his more engaging attributes that his defects consist, in that over-sensibility of heart and warmth of the social affections which are so often combined with blind indulgence to their favourite objects. Inexcusable as such indulgence may be, yet the mixture of paternal

[1] VII. 347. sqq.

affection and courtly gallantry which Priam displays towards the fair adulteress, when once received on the footing of a daughter-in-law, is worthy of all admiration. She herself bears grateful testimony to his kindness, under the mortifications to which she was habitually exposed from her other Trojan connexions. The most touching acknowledgement of this nature is contained in a single parenthetic sentence of her lamentation over Hector, the only one of her new husband's near relatives whose behaviour to her resembled that of her father-in-law. During the long years that had elapsed since her arrival in Troy, never, she exclaims, had a single harsh word been addressed to her by Hector: XXIV. 768.

ἀλλ' εἴ τίς με καὶ ἄλλος ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐνίπτοι,
δαέρων ἢ γαλόων ἢ εἰνατέρων εὐπέπλων,
ἢ ἐκυρή, ἐκυρὸς δὲ πατὴρ ὡς ἤπιος αἰεί,
ἀλλὰ σὺ τόν γ' ἐπέεσσι παραιφάμενος κατέρυκες.

Pages of studied panegyric could hardly equal the effect which this half line produces, partly by its very brevity, partly by the force of the contrast it presents. Another trait of the old sovereign's paternal sensibility equally illustrates the poet's power of conveying the liveliest impressions in the fewest words. When the conversation on the walls is interrupted by the intelligence that Paris is about to engage Menelaus, and that Priam's presence is required to arrange the forms of the duel, we are told simply[1], that after receiving the message "the old man shuddered, and ordered his chariot to be prepared." No elaborate description of parental anxiety could express half as much as this short sentence.

[1] III. 259.; conf. 305. sqq.

It is, however, in the closing scenes of the Iliad that the brighter side of Priam's character is most prominently brought forward. All sense of his vices or follies is here absorbed by compassion for the calamities in which they have involved him, and admiration for his heroism in braving the dangers of a hostile camp and the wrath of Achilles, to rescue the remains of a beloved son from mutilation and disgrace. But even here the poet, still true to nature, never loses sight of the less favourable traits of the portrait, which, as now reproduced under a change of fortune, impart a new variety to the whole composition. Hitherto Priam had been contemplated in a comparative state of prosperity, and distinguished, even in his displays of weakness, by a decorum and placidity of deportment becoming his royal state. Now, at the moment when his energies are intent on the fulfilment of the noblest duties, his temper, under the accumulated excitement of the crisis, breaks through all the restraints of courtly dignity into ebullitions of senile petulance and irritation, as characteristic of the genius of the man as inconsistent with the greatness of his conduct. The scene in the palace previous to his journey is one of the finest in the Iliad.[1] Priam, his family, and the entire city are plunged in the deepest affliction; their favourite prince and bravest champion slain; his body daily insulted in their sight by his ferocious conqueror. The mode in which the national grief finds vent exhibits a fine combination of Oriental and patriarchal manners. The old king, enveloped in his mantle, is seated in the centre of the palace court in a state of gloomy stupor, indifferent to all that is passing.

[1] xxiv. 159. sqq.

His sons are weeping and his daughters wailing around him; the halls and porches thronged with citizens, flocking with sympathetic curiosity to the centre of the common woe. At this moment Iris, invisible to all but Priam himself, breathes her message from Jove in his ear. The first symptom of response to the divine intimation is a tremor pervading his frame. On a sudden, morbid despair gives place to unwonted vigour; he rises and declares his resolution forthwith to visit in person the Myrmidon camp, and ransom the body of his son. He is assailed by the remonstrances of his wife against the madness of his project, but in vain. On turning to give the requisite orders for his journey, he finds everything in confusion[1]; his palace is crowded with importunate idlers; his sons are bewildered by this sudden change from listlessness to temerity, and the promptness of their obedience falls short of the eagerness of his commands. His temper then gives way, and he breaks forth into invectives, first against the busybodies who encumber his hall, and whom he drives with his sceptre into the street; next against the sluggish apathy of his sons, tauntingly contrasting it with the devoted zeal of their deceased brother. The petulance of these sallies is tempered by the most touching expressions of grief and patriotism. Every word and act is admirably suited to the character and the occasion.

The sequel of this adventure supplies the more delicate finish to the portrait both of Priam and Achilles. The ardent zeal, senile importunity, and pious resignation of the venerable suppliant, are beautifully contrasted with the generous sympathy

[1] xxiv. 237. sqq.

and haughty impetuosity of the terrible Myrmidon. The old king returns to the city with his precious freight, greeted by crowds of admiring citizens, and the ensuing rites in honour of the slain champion afford an impressive conclusion to the great drama. Upon the whole perhaps the character of Priam is, next to that of Achilles, the most delicately conceived and finely drawn in the poem. The parallel which it offers to that of Shakspeare's Lear cannot fail to suggest itself to the critical student.

HECTOR.

Character of Hector.

16. In the character of this hero, as in that of his father, good and evil are so curiously blended, that it is hard to say which element predominates. Homer, partly it would seem in order to maintain a fair show of impartiality, partly to enhance the glory of the Greek warriors by whom the Trojan champion is successively worsted, magnifies his prowess in general terms, as of the most transcendant order. But these eulogies are confined alone or chiefly to words. In actual achievement Hector is greatly surpassed by the leading Greek heroes. He rarely enters the lists on equal terms with an enemy of equal rank, but he is beaten; and his whole series of triumphs is artfully so described as to appear owing less to his own valour than to supernatural interference. The moral courage of Hector, on the other hand, is worthy of all praise. Though easily over-elated by success, he is not, like the Greek commander, apt to be cast down by discomfiture. The vaunting bravadoes with which he pursues the tide of victory in the absence of Achilles are, it is true, singularly unbecoming in a leader who, before the secession of

that hero, never ventured to quit the protection of the city walls. This timid policy, however, he himself pointedly describes as having been imposed on him by the Trojan elders[1]; nor on the reappearance of his formidable adversary is he disheartened, but endeavours, like a brave soldier rather than a prudent tactician, to maintain his newly acquired superiority. Towards the close of his career, although he flies before Achilles when first brought face to face with him on the field, yet, having once made up his mind to the combat, he acquits himself manfully, and submits to his fate with calmness and dignity.

Among the heroes of the Iliad, Hector is the one whose social virtues are exhibited in the most engaging colours, less perhaps from any actual superiority to various other chiefs, to Ulysses for example or Menelaus, in those qualities, than from the greater opportunities for their display. His chaste affection for one virtuous spouse appears the more admirable as contrasted with the licentious habits of his race. Helen, also, bears lively testimony to that unvarying courtesy and fraternal kindness which supported her under the mortifications to which she was exposed from the rest of her paramour's family[2], so well deserved on her part, so heartlessly inflicted on theirs. The deep distress which his death spreads over the city is a testimony to his worth, both as a benefactor and a warrior; and the interview with Andromache, where his virtues as a husband, a parent, and a patriot, are so beautifully portrayed, is too familiar to every student of the poet to require comment. These finer ingredients of his character also shine forth in a singularly amiable light in his first personal en-

[1] Il. xv. 721. [2] xxiv. 768.

counter with Achilles, where his habitual terror for the invincible hero suddenly gives way on seeing his youthful brother Polydorus pierced before his eyes by the Myrmidon lance. The electric effect on his energies is described in one of the poet's most brilliant sketches: XX. 419.

ὡς ἐνόησε κασίγνητον Πολύδωρον,
ἐντερα χερσὶν ἔχοντα, λιαζόμενον προτὶ γαίῃ,
κάρ ῥά οἱ ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλύς· οὐδ' ἄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη
δηρὸν ἐκὰς στρωφᾶσθ', ἀλλ' ἀντίος ἦλθ' Ἀχιλῆος,
ὀξὺ δόρυ κραδάων, φλογὶ εἴκελος.

With a clearer insight into the difference between right and wrong than was common among his fellow-councillors, Hector was sufficiently alive to the crime of Paris, and the consequent iniquity of the Trojan cause. Yet the national spirit of indifference extends even to him. In stigmatising, as he frequently does, his brother's guilt, no account is taken of his own, as accomplice or abettor. His share in the prevailing levity is also painfully exemplified in his conduct regarding the duel of Paris and Menelaus. It was his imperative duty, as Trojan commander, and original proposer of the truce, to have enforced, at whatever cost, the fulfilment of its terms, so solemnly ratified by his father in his own presence; but so far is he from showing even a desire to preserve faith, that the base mode of its violation meets with his virtual sanction and approval.

His oratory.

17. But the characteristic defect of Hector, of which Homer chiefly avails himself to individualise his portrait, is his turn for vainglorious boasting. The success which has here attended the poet's

efforts cannot be better illustrated than by the fact, that the name Hector is familiar to this day in our own tongue, as a popular synonyme of our vernacular phrases "bluster" and "swagger." In Hector the infirmity assumes a more offensive form than in the Greek heroes who indulge in it, owing to the magnitude of his deeds being, as a general rule, so little in keeping with that of his words. During the brilliant career of Diomed in the fifth book the Trojan chief, it is indirectly implied, was either bewildered or intimidated; for the first notice of his presence on the field is a reproof levelled at his backwardness by his Lycian ally Sarpedon. The justice of the taunt is proved by the mode of its reception: "Hector makes no reply, though cut to the heart."[1] It rouses him, however, to exertion, but his valour is still directed only against the secondary Greek warriors; nor does he venture to face Diomed until reinforced by Mars in person. After the discomfiture of the god by Diomed, no more is heard of Hector, until, quitting the field, he proceeds to the city to propitiate divine aid against the formidable Greek.[2] On his return, guaranteed on divine authority[3] against all personal risk, he challenges the best champion of the enemy to single combat, in an address full of vainglorious pomp; but, on Ajax entering the lists, Hector is described as trembling, and ready to evade the contest could he have done so with a good grace.[4] In a subsequent battle, when Diomed is actually forced off the field by the thunderbolts of Jupiter, after struggling, with a heroism altogether unknown to the Trojan chief,

[1] v. 472—493. [2] vi. 102. [3] vii. 52. [4] vii. 216.

against his irresistible adversary, the assertion by Hector of the whole credit of a victory in which he had no share, and his exulting taunts against the Greek hero, form a climax of bullying rhodomontade: VIII. 164., cf. 532.

ἔρρε κακὴ γλήνη! ἐπεὶ οὐκ, εἴξαντος ἐμεῖο,
πύργων ἡμετέρων ἐπιβήσεαι. . . .

The same tone is maintained in the ensuing address to his troops; and here may be observed another characteristic of his vaunting rhetoric, that his allusions to the past, present, or anticipated successes of the Trojans are habitually, if not invariably, couched in the first person. By *his* single arm the whole Greek army was to be cut to pieces, their fleet to be destroyed: VIII. 178.

τὰ δ' οὐ μένος ἀμὸν ἐρύξει· . . .
ἀλλ' ὅτε κεν δὴ νηυσὶν ἔπι γλαφυρῇσι γένωμαι, . . .
ὡς πυρὶ νῆας ἐνιπρήσω, κτείνω δὲ καὶ αὐτούς.[1] . .

In the sequel his scorn for "the girlish caitiff" Diomed, is somewhat damped by his defeat in single combat by that hero, from whom he escapes his death-blow by a timely flight.[2] The blunt simplicity of the Greek hero's style of asserting his real superiority is here finely contrasted with Hector's inflated tone of exultation, often called forth by victories in which he had no share. His contempt for Achilles while absent, is equal to that for Diomed, and is amusingly displayed in his present by anticipation of the Myrmidon chief's horses to Dolon, in reward of his proffered services as spy.[3]

[1] Conf. 498. 526., XI. 288., XVI. 835., XVIII. 293. These and other similar passages seem too pointed to be the result of anything but specific design.

[2] XI. 359. seqq.; conf. XI. 542., XIV. 408. [3] X. 329.

Another favourite form in which his vainglorious spirit displays itself, is his prospective enjoyment of the eulogies to be passed by posterity on his exploits.[1] This weakest point in his character is also illustrated by one of the happiest similes in the Iliad. When charging with impetuous valour, and threatening, in his usual tone of menace and bluster so long as he meets with no resistance, to annihilate Greeks, ships, and ramparts, but suddenly halting and retreating before a body of resolute opponents, he is compared to a fragment of rock rolling furiously down a precipitous declivity, but brought to an immediate standstill on reaching the level plain.[2]

It is, however, in the last scene of the life of Patroclus, that this unfavourable side of Hector's character is most broadly exhibited. On the panic produced by the sudden appearance of the friend of Achilles on the field, Hector is the first to fly, strenuously exhorting his troops to follow him.[3] No sooner however had the death-blow of Patroclus been inflicted by another hand, than Hector steps in, and, putting the finishing stroke to his sufferings, forthwith arrogates to himself the whole credit of the conquest.[4] The dying words of Patroclus are a spirited reproof of the meanness and ferocity of this conduct. In the ensuing struggle for the body, the risk of a meeting with Ajax upon equal terms is avoided by a speedy retreat into the ranks. This pusillanimity calls forth two successive reproofs from the Lycian prince Glaucus[5], similar to the one formerly administered by that hero's brother Sar-

[1] VII. 87. 300., VI. 477.
[2] XIII. 136. sqq.
[3] XVI. 367. sqq. 656.
[4] XVI. 818—843.
[5] XVI. 538., XVII. 129—141.

pedon. The same afternoon Hector flies terror-struck before the mere voice of Achilles, standing naked in the distance. Yet, in the evening council of war, he affects to disdain the notion of any superiority in the mighty Hellene, on whom he even pledges himself[1], scorning the wise caution of Polydamas, to inflict summary chastisement on the following day. It need scarcely be added, that this bravado was as completely falsified by the issue of the ensuing combat as it was fatally expiated.

ÆNEAS,

Character of Æneas.

18. The commander next in rank to Hector is one of that respectable and blameless class of heroes, who, without salient features either of singularity or defect, have been often promoted by popular epic poets to the dignity of protagonist. In this capacity, as the experience of most readers can testify, they seldom fail to acquit themselves with much propriety perhaps, but with a proportional degree of dulness.[2] In the Iliad however the commonplace attributes of Æneas,

[1] XVIII. 285. sq.

[2] Among the great poets of antient or modern times, there is none more deficient in that highest attribute of his art, the portraiture of human character, than the elegant and popular bard of Rome. It is therefore both a curious and a fortunate coincidence, that precisely the one among Homer's heroes whom the nature of Virgil's subject led him to select as the protagonist of his own poem, should be the one whose equability of disposition came more immediately within the sphere of its author's talent. Hector or Diomed would in his hands infallibly have forfeited their genuine Homeric spirit. An elaborate effort to maintain their distinctive features would have resulted but in servile imitation; an attempt at novelty would have invested them with the ranting ferocity of Turnus, or the solemn dignity of Æneas himself. Even the slight variations in the character of the Dardanian chief are not successful. While they fail to enliven its tameness, they divest it of that moral worth which in the Iliad forms its most agreeable attribute.

unshackled as he is with any such higher responsibility, are not without their value. They add at least a pleasing variety to the other livelier traits of human nature, and a seasonable relief to the levity which forms the general characteristic of the hero's countrymen. The valour of Æneas, if less impetuous, is more steady than that of Hector. His undertakings are always equal to his professions, and often superior to his means of performance. He engages manfully both Diomed and Achilles, and on each occasion acquits himself with credit.[1]

It was not to be expected that the portrait of such a character would be marked by any broad dramatic touches; yet Homer has managed to shed a warmer ray of interest over it, by allusions to certain peculiarities in the political destiny of the hero, of some importance in their connexion with the mythic cycle of which the Iliad forms the nucleus. During the early part of the assault on the Greek lines Æneas is described as standing aloof, from resentment at some indignity lately put on him by Priam, and which is implied to have been but one of a series of similar slights proceeding from the same quarter.[2] Neither the time, place, nor manner of the offence are mentioned, as being probably matters familiar to the poet's public, and embodied, like other legends to which he incidentally alludes, by other popular organs of mythical lore. Some light, however, is thrown on the mystery by the circumstance that Æneas, in spite of his royal blood and personal merit, is never represented as taking part in the deliberations of the Trojan council. One of the most important meetings of that body, in which the proposal

[1] v. 217. sq., xx. 160. sq. [2] xiii. 459.; conf. xii. 99.

of Antenor to accommodate matters by restoring Helen was discussed and rejected, was held immediately before the action where Æneas is described as offended at Priam.[1] All this must be taken in connexion with the cyclic legend, that Antenor and Æneas alone among the Trojans had from the first advocated conciliatory measures. Such conduct could hardly fail to be personally offensive to Priam, as the abettor of his son's iniquities. Hence it may be supposed that the insult resented by Æneas was connected with the late suggestion of Antenor; and the intimacy between the two heroes is confirmed by the circumstance, that the sons of Antenor are described as lieutenants of the troops of Æneas.[2] In the sequel, the patriotism of the Dardanian chief gets the better of his wrath[3], and the next allusion to his personal history is on occasion of his encounter with Achilles. His safety is here described as an object of interest even to the deities most hostile to Troy, and Neptune, in delivering him when defeated, proclaims the decree of destiny, that on the destruction of Ilium and extinction of the race of Priam, "Æneas and his descendants shall continue to reign over the Trojans."[4] From this text it has been not unreasonably inferred that in Homer's time there existed a state, probably in the Troad or its neighbourhood, which traced its origin to a remnant of the Trojan people, and the reigning family of which claimed a descent from Æneas.

Character of Hecuba. Funeral dirge of Hector.

19. The spirited individuality imparted to the other leading Trojan characters, Hecuba, Andromache, Paris and Helen, is the more remarkable in proportion to the limited nature of the parts which

[1] VII. 347. [2] II. 822. [3] XIII. 489.
[4] XX. 307.; conf. Hymn. Ven. 197., Heyn. Exc. XVII. ad Æn. II.

they respectively perform. The portrait of each appears to be worked up with the same distinct traces and lively colours as those of Achilles or Hector; yet, on examining the machinery by which so much effect is produced, we find it amounts to but a few incidental speeches or turns of dramatic action.

Hecuba's most prominent appearance on the scene is during the climax of national and domestic calamity consequent on the death of her son. Her character, as there exhibited under the influence of sore affliction and excited passions, is a mixture of the fond mother, the devoted wife, and the high-tempered vindictive virago. While feelingly alive to the cruelty of the Hellenic invaders, she entirely overlooks the provocation they had received, or the folly and iniquity of its authors. In her reply[1] to Priam's announcement of his purpose to visit the quarters of Achilles, her affectionate solicitude for her husband's welfare displays itself, not in the calm persuasive remonstrance suited to such an occasion, but in an impetuous burst of reproof on the madness of his enterprise. Her invectives against Achilles in the sequel of the same address, bespeak the ferocity of the bereaved tigress, rather than the grief of the human mother. In her imputation to him of those very vices of treachery and falsehood which especially attached to her own family, but with which he of all men was least chargeable; and in her broad misstatement of the merits of the cause in which Hector fell, and of his conduct as its champion, the loose morality of her race appears in graphic conjunction with her own ardent temper and revengeful spirit: XXIV. 205.

[1] XXIV. 200.

ὠμηστὴς καὶ ἄπιστος ἀνὴρ ὅδε, οὐ σ' ἐλεήσει,
οὐδέ τί σ' αἰδέσεται· . . .
. . . . . τοῦ ἐγὼ μέσον ἦπαρ ἔχοιμι
ἐσθέμεναι προσφῦσα· τότ' ἄντιτα ἔργα γένοιτο
παιδὸς ἐμοῦ! ἐπεὶ οὔ ἑ κακιζόμενόν γε κατέκτα, . . .
. . . οὔτε φόβου μεμνημένον οὔτ' ἀλεωρῆς.

Another natural, though far from pleasing, trait of Hecuba, is her harsh treatment of Helen. That heroine herself keenly contrasts the unkindness of her mother-in-law with the unvarying gentleness and courtesy of the generous Priam.

The funeral lamentation[1] uttered alternately by Hecuba, Andromache, and Helen, over the corpse of Hector, is another example, to be classed with the debate in the tent of Achilles, of Homer's talent of adapting to different speakers their proper vein of oratory. The tone of Hecuba is here comparatively subdued, as befitted the occasion. Yet, in the midst of her fond ebullition of maternal grief, her vindictive spirit against Achilles still breaks forth, in her expressions of sarcastic triumph over the previous death of his friend by the hand of Hector.

In Andromache, all spirit of anger, so little congenial at any time to her gentle nature, is absorbed in excess of woe. She dwells on her own widowed state, on her infant bereaved of such a father, her country of such a protector. Her mind, wandering with mournful pride over his former glories, anticipates with prophetic horror the approaching fall of the city, and the cruel fate reserved by the Greeks for those nearest and dearest to the author of so much disaster to themselves. Any general remarks on the character of this most interesting heroine will

[1] xxiv. 723. sqq.

be reserved for the Odyssey, where the parallel between her and Penelope will aid in illustrating the common genius of the two poems.

Helen's affectionate testimony to the social virtues of her slain brother-in-law, though replete with tender feeling, and expressed with all the suavity and grace which became her, is alloyed by something of the querulous captious spirit which also appears in her whole demeanour throughout the poem. She mourns his death, less as a national calamity, than for the loss it entailed on herself of a friend and supporter under the humiliations to which she was exposed from her other relatives, to whose conduct she cannot withhold a taunting allusion.

Characters of Paris and Helen.

20. The best answer perhaps, to the charge of incapacity in a "a poet of so rude an age" to conceive so elaborate a composition as the Iliad, is to be found in the characters of Paris and Helen, the hero and heroine on whose destinies the action of the poem fundamentally hinges. Their joint portrait also illustrates a former remark, that the intermediate stage of manners, equally removed from barbarism and refinement, which supplied such materials for the epic art, is precisely that best adapted to secure its perfection. Paris and Helen are the beau and the belle, the man of fashion and the woman of pleasure, of the heroic age. Such characters are essentially unpoetical in more civilised periods. No two can here be more in harmony with the genius of the poem or with each other. Both are unprincipled votaries of sensual enjoyment; both self-willed and petulant, but not devoid of amiable and generous feeling. Both are distinguished for personal graces and accomplishments, and the consequent importance they attach

to elegance of attire, and other means of turning those advantages to account. In both, this combination of attributes has been shadowed forth with a graphic precision, the more remarkable considering the limited appearance of each on the scene.

The general conduct of Paris exhibits that mixture of conflicting qualities, of bravery and effeminacy, petulance and good-humour, self-conceit and submissive respect for the superior worth of others, so common, as the experience of every man of the world can testify, in persons of similar tastes and habits. It is obviously not the effect of accident, that in the opening scene of the first battle[1], this gallant adventurer, the primary cause of the whole mischief, appears as the prominent figure, strutting with all the airs of a national champion in front of the Trojan lines. No sooner however does he observe Menelaus advancing to engage him, than conscience-smitten and crest-fallen he retreats into the ranks: but the moment after, stung by the reproof of Hector, he proposes and manfully sustains a single combat with his rival. The ensuing altercation in the chamber of Helen, and the mode in which by mutual consent it is brought to a close, are equally characteristic. After lounging the greater part of the day in her apartments, he is found by Hector[2] engaged in burnishing his armour; and when again roused to activity by his brother's reproof, he issues to the battle with an ostentatious gaiety illustrated by one of the finest similes in the Iliad, that of the horse emancipated from the stall and prancing across the plain to the river.[3] The more rational side of his

[1] III. 16. sqq. [2] VI. 313. [3] VI. 506.

character is exhibited chiefly in his interviews with Hector, whose martial superiority commands his profound respect. He submits in silence to the most cutting reproofs of his noble brother, and cheerfully obeys all his suggestions. It is true, on the other hand, that Hector's remonstrances are directed solely at his want of energy in the field. They never touch on his amorous indulgence, or the duty of reparation for his crime. The proposal of Antenor to the latter effect is received in a very different spirit, with the petulant effrontery of the spoiled child and pampered man of pleasure.

Helen is the female counterpart of Paris. Daughter of an illustrious royal house, the most beautiful princess of her age, she is wedded in extreme youth to a husband who, however worthy of her choice, seems not to have engaged her affections. She becomes, consequently, an easy victim of the fascinating adventurer destined by the goddess of love as her future partner. Helen, as frequently happens with frail women, a natural result perhaps of the same susceptibility in which their failings originate, is distinguished by tenderness of heart and kindly disposition. Traces of better principle seem also to lurk under the general levity of her habits. Though a faithful consort to Paris, who on his part is no way deficient in the duties of husband or lover, she still entertains a fond remembrance of her days of youthful innocence. She looks back at times with remorse and regret, almost with longing desire, to her native land, her deserted child, and the home of her fathers; and is as ready to acknowledge and condemn her own faults, as to appreciate the opposite

virtues of others.[1] The finer touches with which her portrait is worked up are all of the more delicate dramatic description. In the emotion she displays at the invitation of Æneas to go forth to the ramparts and witness the preparation for the duel between her past and present husband; in her dignified advance to the admiring old senators; in her grief and self-reproach at the distant view of her countrymen and former friends; in her petulant argument with her patron goddess after the defeat of Paris; in the taunts thrown out against his cowardice, coupled with returning fondness for his person; in her frank acknowledgment to Hector of the common failings of herself and lover; and in her affectionate lamentation for the fate of her noble brother-in-law, mingled with selfish tears for her own distresses, are exhibited to the life all the finer features of that mixed female character, which, while we pity and condemn, we are constrained to love and admire.

If the facts in the foregoing analysis be correctly stated, and the citations admit of being verified, it seems difficult to understand how any impartial reader, who has carefully weighed those facts and citations, can believe it possible that a series of such singularly delicate portraits, individualised by so subtle a unity of mechanism, not only in their broader features of peculiarity, but in the nicest turns of sentiment and phraseology, can be the produce of the medley of artists to which the Wolfian school assigns them. It were about as probable that some ten or twenty sculptors of the age of Pericles, undertaking, without previous concert, each a different

[1] III. 139. 173., VI. 344., XXIV. 764. sqq.

part or limb of a statue of Jupiter, should have produced the Olympian Jove of Phidias, as that a number of ballad-singers of the ante-Olympic era should have combined, by a similar process of patch-work, in producing the Achilles, or Agamemnon, the Priam, the Hector, or the Helen of Homer.

CHAP. VIII.

HOMER. ODYSSEY. CONCORDANCE OF THE TEXT.

1. EPITOME OF THE ACTION. — 2. PLAN OF THE POEM CONTRASTED WITH THAT OF THE ILIAD. — 3. APOLOGUE OF ALCINOÜS. — 4. VOYAGE OF TELEMACHUS. NOËMON. PIRÆUS CLYTIDES. — 5. MELANTHIUS AND MELANTHO. THE SEER THEOCLYMENUS. — 6. PERVADING INFLUENCE OF APOLLO.

1. A SIMILAR course of analysis will here be pursued in regard to the plan and composition of the Odyssey as in the previous case of the Iliad. Attention will first be directed to the mechanical structure, and next to the poetical design, of the work.

I.

Epitome of the action.

After all the other heroes of the Trojan war had either perished or resettled in their homes[1], Ulysses, bereaved of his fleet and companions, victims of their own impiety in slaughtering the oxen of the Sun[2], is detained in exile by the sea goddess Calypso in her island of Ogygia.[3] The origin of his disasters is traced to the vengeance of Neptune, who, indignant at the blinding of his son Polyphemus, had vowed unrelenting persecution, to any extent short of death, against the hero, up to the moment when he should set foot on his native island.[4] The rest of the gods, friendly to Ulysses, take council concerning him in Olympus, during the absence of Neptune in Æthiopia.[5] Pallas entreats Jove to send Mercury to Calypso with an order for his release.[6] She then proceeds to Ithaca, to instigate Telemachus, after protesting in public assembly against the oppression of his mother's suitors, to undertake a voyage to Pylos and Sparta[7], and inquire of Nestor and Menelaus, the most recently returned among the heroes of

[1] 11. 286.; conf. III. 181. 188. sqq. [2] 8.; conf. XII. 353., XI. 108. [3] 14. 51. 84.; conf. IV. 557., V. 30., VII. 244., XVII. 140. [4] 21. 75.; conf. VI. 331., IX. 532. sqq., XI. 102., XIII. 125. 341. [5] 22.; conf. V. 282. [6] 84.; conf. V. 28., X. 277. [7] 279. sqq.; conf. II. 262.

the war[1], concerning his father's fate. In the disguise of Mentes, a neighbouring chief, she is hospitably received by the young prince. Phemius, the court bard of Ithaca, attends unwillingly at the banquet[2] of the suitors. In the course of the various dialogues mention is made of the distressed condition of old Laertes in his country retirement[3], and of the vengeance recently inflicted at Mycenæ, in the eighth year after the fall of Troy, by Orestes, on Ægisthus the murderer of his father Agamemnon.[4]

II.

The next morning the Ithacan assembly is held. The debate is opened by Ægyptius, father of Antiphus, one of the mariners of Ulysses devoured by Polyphemus. Antinoüs and Eurymachus, the ringleaders of the suitors, justify their own conduct and blame Penelope, who, after authorising their courtship by a promise to select a husband from among them on completion of her pretended web[5], had treacherously failed of performance. They make light of the projected voyage of Telemachus, not expecting he will have the spirit to carry it into effect.[6] After the council, Telemachus offers up a prayer to Pallas, reminding her of her promises and advice of the day before.[7] She appears to him in the form of Mentor an old friend of his father. With her assistance he takes his measures the same night; collects his crew, borrows a vessel of Noëmon[8] another friend, and sets sail, communicating his intention to no one in the palace but his father's nurse Euryclea, on whom he enjoins secrecy.[9]

III.

In the morning he arrives with Mentor at Pylos. Nestor describes the fate of the heroes of Troy, all of whom, with the single exception of Ulysses, had either perished or resettled in their native seats.[10] Nestor also mentions the recent death of Ægisthus by the hand of Orestes, eight years after the murder of Agamemnon.[11] He advises his guest to visit Sparta, where Menelaus, being lately returned from his own eight years of wandering[12],

[1] 286.; conf. III. 306., IV. 82. [2] 154.; conf. XXII. 351. [3] 189.; conf. IV. 735., et locc. citt. [4] 300.; conf. 30. 40., III. 198. 257. 306. sqq., IV. 82. 91. 546., XI. 409., XIII. 382.
[5] 87. sqq.; conf. XIX. 138. [6] 301.; conf. IV. 638. sq. [7] 262.; conf. I. 279. [8] 386.; conf. IV. 630. [9] 348. 373.; conf. IV. 742.
[10] 181.; conf. I. 11. et locc. citt. [11] 198.; conf. I. 300., et locc. citt.
[12] 306.; conf. I. 286., IV. 82.

will be more competent to afford the desired information. Next morning Telemachus sets out in a chariot with Pisistratus son of Nestor, and on the second night is hospitably received at Sparta by Menelaus.

IV.

On the morrow Menelaus relates his travels, and informs his guests of what he had heard of the detention of Ulysses in the island of Calypso, from Proteus the prophetic sea god of Egypt[1], who had also predicted his own return in the eighth year, just after the death of Ægisthus by the hand of Orestes[2], as since fulfilled. During the absence of Telemachus, the suitors are apprised of his expedition by Noëmen[3], who, in want of his vessel, inquires of them the probable period of his return. They are astonished at the prince's boldness, supposing him to be only absent at his farm.[4] By advice of Antinoüs they determine to waylay and murder him on his voyage home. Antinoüs fits out a vessel for that purpose, and takes his station at the island of Asteris.[5] Penelope, informed by Medon[6] the herald of the suitors' plot, extracts the particulars of her son's expedition from Eurycleа[7], and sends for the chief gardener Dolius from the farm, in order that he may convey the intelligence to the old king Laertes.[8]

V.

In the council of Olympus Pallas again complains of the fate of her favourite Ulysses, and Jupiter assures her that both the hero and his son will safely return and baffle the designs of the suitors. He then dispatches Hermes[9] to procure the release of Ulysses, and his passage from Ogygia[10] to Scheria; whence the Phæacians will transport him, laden with rich presents[11], to Ithaca. On the fifth day afterwards the hero sets sail on a raft. After an eighteen days' voyage[12] he arrives within sight of Scheria, where Neptune, on his journey from Æthiopia[13], descries him, raises a

[1] 557.; conf. I. 14., et loco. citt. [2] 82. 91. 546.; conf. I. 286., et locc. citt., 300., et locc. citt. [3] 630.; conf. II. 386. [4] 638. 663; conf. II. 301. [5] 669.; conf. 846., XIII. 425., XV. 28. 300., XVI. 352. [6] 696.; conf. XVI. 412., XXII. 371. [7] 742.; conf. II. 348. [8] 735. sqq.; conf. XXIV. 205. 387., I. 189., XI. 187., XV. 353.

[9] 28.; conf. I. 84., X. 277. [10] 30. sq.; conf. I. 14., et locc. citt. [11] 37.; conf. XIII. 119. 135. 10. sq., VIII. 389. 438. [12] 278.; conf. VII. 268. [13] 282. sqq.; conf. I. 22.

storm, and dashes the raft to pieces. Ulysses, under the joint protection of Pallas and the sea goddess Leucothea, after swimming during two days on a plank, reaches the shore of Scheria in safety, but cold and naked, near the mouth of a river[1]; and, nestling in the bushes falls asleep.

VI.

Nausicaa, daughter of Alcinoüs king of the Phæacians, warned by Minerva in a dream, descends in the morning with her damsels to the river[2], to wash the family clothes. Ulysses, roused by their voices, awakes and implores her protection. She supplies him with food and raiment[3], and instructs him to follow her into the city at a later hour, and, on arrival at the palace, to appeal to the good offices of her mother Arete[4], who will procure him a safe convoy home from her father. Pallas continues to befriend the hero, though secretly for fear of her uncle Neptune, whose wrath against him was to remain unrelaxed until his arrival in Ithaca.[5]

VII.

After sunset the hero enters the city, guided by Minerva in the disguise of a Phæacian maiden. Through the intercession of Arete[6] he is hospitably received by Alcinoüs, and promised a passage home. The queen recognises the clothes[7] given him by Nausicaa, as part of her family wardrobe. On being questioned on the subject, he relates his eighteen days' voyage from Ogygia[8] and shipwreck on their coast.

VIII.

On the following day he is honourably entertained by the Phæacians, and presented with valuable gifts, which queen Arete packs in a precious box.[9] During the banquet Alcinoüs mentions an antient propheey, that one of his vessels would be destroyed on its return from friendly convoy of some wandering stranger to his home, and that their city would be overwhelmed with an earthquake by their patron and progenitor Neptune, from jealousy[10]

[1] 441.; conf. VI. 85.

[2] 85.; conf. V. 441. [3] 214.; conf. VII. 238. [4] 310.; conf. VII. 145., XI. 338. [5] 331.; conf. I. 21., et locc. citt.

[6] 145.; conf. VI. 310., XI. 338. [7] 238.; conf. VI. 214. [8] 268. 244.; conf. V. 278., I. 14., et locc. citt.

[9] 389. 438.; conf. V. 37., et locc. citt. [10] 565. sqq.; conf. XIII. 149. sqq. 172.

of their skill and activity in naval affairs. He then requests Ulysses to relate his history.

IX.

The hero complies; and, commencing with his departure from Troy, describes his attack on the Ciconians, his visit to the Lotophagi, and his adventures in the cave of Polyphemus. He relates how that giant, furious at the loss of his eye, offers up a successful prayer to his father Neptune[1] for vengeance on his mutilator: "that, if ever destined to revisit his native land, the hero might return a solitary wanderer, after the entire destruction of his fleet and comrades; and that on his arrival in Ithaca he might be welcomed by fresh trouhles and calamities."

X.

Ulysses next describes his arrival at the island of Æolia, and hospitahle reception hy the lord of the winds, who at parting gives him the adverse gales secured in a bag, Zephyrus being left out to guide his course. The good intentions of the god are defeated by the folly of the mariners, who open the bag and the fleet is driven hack to the island. They then sail to the port of the Læstrygonians, hy whom the whole armada is destroyed, with the exception of the hero's own vessel and crew. He next arrives at the island of the goddess Circe, where, after baffling her magic arts hy aid of Hermes, and checking an attempt at mntiny by his lieutenant Eurylochus[2], he is entertained by the goddess during a year. At its expiry he sails hy her instructions to the infernal regions, to consult Tiresias[3] regarding his future destinies. In the hurry of departure Elpenor[4], one of his mariners, heavy with sleep falls down the stair and breaks his neck.

XI.

On arrival in the Shades Ulysses conjures up the ghosts in the mode enjoined hy Circe. The first to appear is that of Elpenor[5], who complains of his neglected obsequies, and is promised satisfaction on the hero's return to the upper world. Tiresias[6] predicts

[1] 532. sqq.; conf. i. 21., et locc. citt.

[2] 429.; conf. xii. 278. sqq. [3] 492.; conf. xi. 90. sqq., xxiii. 251. 323. [4] 552.; conf. xi. 51., xii. 10.

[5] 51.; conf. x. 552., xii. 10. [6] 90. sqq.; conf. x. 492., et locc. citt.

the future calamities of Ulysses, consequent on Neptune's anger[1] at the blinding of his Cyclop son, also how the impiety of the hero's crew, in slaughtering the oxen of the Sun[2] in the isle of Thrinacia, will involve their destruction and that of the hero's remaining vessel; but that he himself will be spared, and return home in a foreign ship to exterminate the suitors. A mysterious prophecy is added concerning his subsequent destiny.[3] His mother, Anticlea, next appears, and acquaints him with the state of his family at the epoch of her own death from grief for his supposed loss; Penelope is described as a mourning widow, and Laertes as wasting his life in solitude at his farm.[4] After relating his interview with the shades of other celebrated females, the hero pauses, and Arete congratulates the audience on the genius of the guest she has been the means of introducing to them.[5] In the sequel he relates his dialogue with the ghost of Agamemnon, who describes his own murder[6] by Ægisthus and Clytemnestra. While praising the superior virtue of Penelope, he warns Ulysses against over-reliance even on her fidelity, advising him, on his return, first to ascertain, in disguise[7], the state of his domestic affairs. After interviews with Achilles, Ajax, and other heroes, Ulysses sails back to the island of Circe.

XII.

He performs the promised rites to Elpenor[8], and commences his voyage homewards, with directions from Circe how to escape the perils of the Sirens, Scylla, and Charybdis. She charges him more especially not to meddle with the oxen of the Sun on the shore of Thrinacia. On approaching the dangerous passes he encourages his crew by the remembrance of their former escape from the jaws of Polyphemus. With the loss of two men, devoured by Scylla, he reaches the Thrinacian coast. His crew, instigated by the mutinous Eurylochus[9], land, in spite of his remonstrances, and slaughter the sacred cattle.[10] On again setting sail the vessel is destroyed by a tempest. Ulysses alone escaping is carried to Ogygia, the isle of Calypso. Here he ends his

[1] 102.; conf. I. 21., et locc. citt. [2] 108.; conf. XII. 353., I. 8. [3] 119. sqq.; conf. X. 492., et locc. citt. [4] 202. 180. sqq.; conf. XV. 358., IV. 735., et locc. citt. [5] 338.; conf. VI. 310., et locc. citt. [6] 409.; conf. I. 300., et locc. citt. [7] 454.; conf. XIII. 397., et locc. citt.
[8] 10.; conf. XI. 51., X. 552. [9] 278.; conf. X. 429. [10] 353.; conf. I. 8., IX. 108.

narrative, having previously described his passage from Ogygia to Scheria.

XIII.

The Phæacian nobles load the hero with presents, in addition to those in the box of Arete.[1] The next evening he embarks in a Phæacian galley, and on the ensuing morning is set ashore in Ithaca fast asleep, together with his valuables.[2] Neptune complains to Jupiter of the hero's convoy home with so rich a cargo, as an interference, on the part of the Phæacians, with the decree "that he should reach his native land in forlorn condition[3];" with Jupiter's sanction, therefore, the god inflicts on them a part of the punishment decreed against their officiousness, by changing their vessel into a rock.[4] Ulysses awaking, is accosted by Minerva, who informs him of his son's absence in Sparta, and of the ambush of the suitors.[5] She promises greater efforts in his cause, being now no longer exposed to collision with her uncle, Neptune[6]; and he supplicates her to guard him against the fate of Agamemnon.[7] She then transforms his outward appearance into that of an aged beggar[8], gives him a staff[9], and, bidding him proceed to the hut of his swineherd Eumæus, departs for Lacedæmon[10] to attend to the affairs of Telemachus.

XIV.

Ulysses, on approaching the farm of Eumæus, is attacked by the dogs, and loses his staff.[11] He is protected and hospitably entertained by the swineherd, to whom he relates a series of fictitious adventures.

XV.

Pallas, on arriving at Sparta[12], warns Telemachus in a vision to return home, avoiding in his voyage the ambush of the suitors[13]; and on reaching Ithaca to visit the swineherd. The prince ac-

[1] 10. sqq.; conf. VIII. 438., v. 37., et locc. citt. [2] 119, 120.; conf. v. 37., et locc. citt. [3] 125.; conf. I. 21., et locc. citt. [4] 149. 172.; conf. VIII. 565. [5] 425.; conf. IV. 669., et locc. citt. [6] 341.; conf. I. 21., et locc. citt. [7] 382.; conf. I. 300., et locc. citt. [8] 397. 430.; conf. XI. 454., XVI. 172. 455. [9] 437.; conf. XIV. 31., XVII. 195. [10] 440.; conf. IV. 620., XV. 1.

[11] 31.; conf. XIII. 437., XVII. 195.

[12] 1.; conf. XIII. 440., IV. 620. [13] 28. 300.; conf. IV. 669., et locc. citt.

cordingly, retracing with Pisistratus his former route, arrives at Pylos. When about to embark for Ithaca he is accosted by the seer Theoclymenus [1], a fugitive from Argos on account of homicide, to whom he affords a passage to Ithaca. The vessel escapes the ambush of Antinoüs by a circuitous course. The same evening Eumæus describes the death of Anticlea, mother of Ulysses, from grief for the supposed loss of her son [2], with the low condition of Laertes.[3] Telemachus, on reaching the nearest shore of Ithaca, lands, and, committing Theoclymenus to the care of Piræus [4], one of his crew, until his own arrival in the city, sends the vessel on to port [5], and proceeds direct to the swineherd's dwelling. Theoclymenus, before parting, prophesies [6] the speedy restoration of the affairs of Ulysses.

XVI.

Telemachus finds Ulysses at breakfast with Eumæus, whom he sends to apprise Penelope of his return. Ulysses, restored by Pallas to his natural form [7], reveals himself to his son. They concert measures for the destruction of the suitors, by removing the arms from the palace hall [8], and assaulting the gang unawares. In the meantime the vessel of Telemachus enters the port of Ithaca.[9] The valuables he had collected in his travels are deposited in the house of Clytius.[10] Soon after, the suitors' galley, disappointed of its object, returns.[11] Antinoüs proposes a fresh attempt on the life of Telemachus, but is dissuaded from it by the less depraved Amphinomus.[12] Penelope, apprised by Eumæus of the arrival of Telemachus, reproaches the suitors with their late designs against her son's life, communicated to her by Medon the herald.[13] Eumæus, in the course of the evening, rejoins Telemachus and Ulysses, now retransformed by Minerva into a mendicant.[14]

XVII.

In the morning Telemachus walks into the town. He again

[1] 223. sqq.; conf. 529. 540., XVII. 72., XX. 372. [2] 358.; conf. XI. 202. [3] 353.; conf. IV. 735., et locc. citt. [4] 540.; conf. 223., et locc. citt. [5] 503.; conf. XVI. 322. [6] 530.; conf. XVII. 160.

[7] 172.; conf. 455., XIII. 397., et locc. citt. [8] 284.; conf. XIX. 4., XXII. 109. [9] 322.; conf. XV. 503. [10] 327.; conf. XVII. 75., et locc. citt. [11] 352.; conf. IV. 669., et locc. citt. [12] 394.; conf. XVIII. 124. 153., XX. 244., XXII. 92. [13] 412.; conf. IV. 696., XXII. 371. [14] 455.; conf. XIII. 397., et locc. citt.

receives Theoclymenus under his protection from Piræus [1], to whose care he consigns the goods brought from Peloponnesus, in order to save them from the suitors' rapacity.[2] He repeats to his mother what he had heard from Menelaus on the authority of Proteus, concerning his father's detention by Calypso [3], and Theoclymenus renews his prophecy of the hero's speedy reappearance.[4] Eumæus, and Ulysses in his character of beggar, provided with a new staff [5] by the swineherd, set out later in the day for the town. On the way the hero is insulted by Melanthius one of his own goatherds, son of Dolius and a favourite of Eurymachus.[6] Ulysses, on arriving at the palace, is contumeliously treated by Antinoüs. Eumæus, in answer to Penelope's inquiries concerning the mendicant guest, informs her of his own three days' entertainment of him at the farm, and of the tidings he professed to have brought of her husband. The queen appoints an interview with the stranger for that evening, in order to make her inquiries in person.[7]

XVIII.

Ulysses chastises the insolence of the beggar Irus, a habitual frequenter of the suitors' banquet. Antinoüs and Eurymachus continue to take the lead in levity and riot. Amphinomus, with better feelings, has gloomy forebodings of evil, which, however, are not sufficient to induce him to flee from the wrath to come, destined as he was to fall by the hand of Telemachus.[8] Ulysses is insulted by Melantho, daughter of Dolius, one of the faithless maidens of Penelope, and paramour of Eurymachus.[9] The revellers soon after retire to repose.

XIX.

Ulysses and Telemachus, when left alone, in accordance with

[1] 72.; conf. xv. 223. 540., xx. 372. [2] 75. sqq.; conf. xvi. 327., xv. 540. [3] 140.; conf. iv. 557., et locc. citt., i. 14., et locc. citt. [4] 160.; conf. xv. 530. [5] 195.; conf. xiv. 31., xiii. 437. This passage of book xvii. has been adduced by B. Thiersch, among other equally forcible arguments, in favour of the doctrine of a patchwork Odyssey. The gift of Eumæus is, he asserts, incompatible with xiii. 437., where Ulysses was already provided with a staff by Minerva. The ingenious critic has overlooked xiv. 31., where the hero loses his divine walking-stick in his encounter with the dogs. [6] 212. 257.; conf. xviii. 321., xix. 65. sqq., xx. 6. 173. [7] 508.; conf. xix. 53. sq.

[8] 124—153.; conf. xvi. 394., et locc. citt. [9] 321. sqq.; conf. xvii. 212., et locc. citt.

their previous plan, remove the arms from the palace hall.[1] Penelope holds her interview with her disguised husband[2], who is again exposed to the insolence of Melantho.[3] The queen explains her stratagem of the web, by which she had deceived the suitors.[4] Eurycleа, while washing the hero's feet, recognises him by a scar received in his youth from the tusk of a boar, when hunting in Parnassus[5]; but, warned by Ulysses, she conceals her discovery. Penelope resolves to entertain the suitors on the morrow with a contest of archery, in shooting through a row of axe-heads[6] with the bow of Ulysses, the winner to have a prior claim to her hand.

XX.

Ulysses reposes in the outer court of the palace, where his slumbers are disturbed by the wanton maidens going forth to join their paramours among the suitors.[7] The next morning being the feast of Apollo, the revels of the suitors are renewed at an early hour.[8] Melanthius[9] the rebel goatherd, and Philœtius[10], a loyal oxherd, arrive with cattle for the daily banquet. The murder of Telemachus is again proposed in the council of suitors, and the project again dropped at the instance of Amphinomus.[11] Ctesippus throws an ox-heel at the head of the disguised king.[12] Theoclymenus warns them of their approaching fate, but is ridiculed by Eurymachus, and retires to the lodging of Piræus.[13]

XXI.

Penelope, as had been arranged, proposes to the suitors the trial of archery with the bow of Ulysses[14], which not one of them is able to string. The hero reveals himself to Eumæus and Philœtius[15] the oxherd, by means of the same boar-tusk wound observed by Eurycleа.[16] He begs for a trial of the bow, but is refused by the suitors. Penelope, after urging them to grant his

[1] 4. sqq.; conf. xvi. 284., xxii. 109. [2] 53. sqq.; conf. xvii. 508. [3] 65. sqq.; conf. xvii. 212. [4] 138.; conf. ii. 87. [5] 393.; conf. xxi. 221., xxiii. 74. [6] 572. sqq.; conf. xxi. 1.

[7] 6. sqq.; conf. xvii. 212., et locc. citt. [8] 155.; see infra, § 6. of this chapter. [9] 173.; conf. xvii. 212., et locc. citt. [10] 185.; conf. xxi. 189., xxii. 104. 285. [11] 244.; conf. xvii. 394., et locc. citt. [12] 299.; conf. xxii. 290. [13] 372.; conf. xvii. 72., et locc. citt.

[14] 1. sqq.; conf. xix. 572. [15] 189.; conf. xx. 185., xxii. 104. 285. [16] 221.; conf. xix. 393., xxiii. 74.

request, retires to her apartments. He then obtains possession of the bow, bends it, and shoots the arrow through the axe-heads.

XXII.

Supported by Telemachus, Eumæus, Philœtius[1], and Pallas, Ulysses assaults the suitors. Antinoüs and Eurymachus are slain by Ulysses, Amphinomus by Telemachus[2], who supplies his party with fresh weapons from the armoury above stairs.[3] Melanthius, detected in a similar attempt, is bound and placed in durance. Philœtius kills Ctesippus, telling him ironically that his death-wound is in return for the cow-heel aimed at the head of Ulysses.[4] In the end the whole suitor crew are destroyed, except Phemius the bard[5] and Medon the herald[6], both having been secretly faithful to the interests of the family, amid an apparent adherence to the suitors. Melanthius and the traitorous females are hanged in the court.

XXIII.

Eurycleа informs the queen of the return of Ulysses, of the death of the suitors, and of her recognition of the hero by the scar on his leg.[7] Penelope, at first incredulous, is convinced by other proofs of his identity. Ulysses anticipating a tumult among the relatives of the suitors, resolves to withdraw in the morning to the farm of Laertes, and take further measures for the reestablishment of his authority. On retiring to rest he recapitulates his past adventures to Penelope, with the mysterious prophecy of Tiresias relative to his future destiny.[8]

XXIV.

Hermes conducts the souls of the suitors to Hades. Ulysses, on arrival at the farm of Laertes, finds him working in his garden[9], and reveals himself. The friends of the suitors, instigated by Eupithes father of Antinoüs, march to avenge the death of their patrons. Ulysses and Laertes, with Dolius and his sons, attack and defeat the rebels; and, through the interposition of Minerva, peace and the royal authority are restored.

[1] 104. 285.; conf. xx. 185., xxi. 189. [2] 92.; conf. xvi. 394., et locc. citt. [3] 109.; conf. xvi. 284., xix. 4. [4] 290.; conf. xx. 299. [5] 351.; conf. i. 154. [6] 371.; conf. xvi. 412., iv. 696.

[7] 74.; conf. xix. 393., xxi. 221. [8] 251. sqq. 323.; conf. x. 492., et locc. citt.

[9] 205. 387.; conf. iv. 735., et locc. citt.

Plan of the poem contrasted with that of the Iliad.

2. In pointing out, on a former occasion, the simplicity of design and continuity of action in the Iliad, as important elements of its characteristic dignity and grandeur, the plan of the Odyssey was appealed to in the way of contrast. In proportion as the adventures of the latter poem are more lively and varied, ranging over a longer period of time and wider extent of space, they naturally involve a greater complication of plot and a more heterogeneous body of actors. This variety of materials the poet, in consistently following out the genius of his subject, has embodied with a corresponding variety of arrangement. In spite however of that chequering and interlacing of the narrative, and those frequent transitions from one to another part of the widely extended scene of action, the dramatic interest of the poem is no less united in itself, and no less firmly concentrated around its one main object, the destinies of Ulysses, than the graver and more solid plot of the Iliad around those of Achilles.

It is further evident, that although this complexity, as producing a greater apparent disconnexion of the parts of the poem, may seem at first view to favour the theory of their independent origin, yet, if the corresponding nicety of the mode in which they are interwoven be taken into account, the result is even less compatible with any such theory than the more simple arrangement of the Iliad. Hence, while with some more zealous but less critical followers of Wolf, the comparatively disjointed action of the Odyssey has supplied ground for still more determined attacks than have been directed against the Iliad, the more sagacious commentators of the same school have admitted the difficulties interposed by

this intricacy of mechanical structure to be most formidable or even insuperable. This might be made the more apparent, by submitting the integral portions of the poem to the same specific test of analysis formerly applied to the corresponding subdivisions of the Iliad. In the present case however, leaving the reader who may be so disposed, to follow out such narrower scrutiny for himself by aid of the foregoing compendium, we shall be content with a few general remarks on some of the more delicate or more characteristic links in the general chain of connexion.

"Apologue of Alcinoüs."

3. The "Apologue of Alcinoüs"[1] is perhaps, upon the whole, the subdivision of the Odyssey combining the greatest amount of those requisites which, by the aid of a certain degree of alteration, addition, or curtailment, might constitute it an independent poem; and as such, accordingly, it has been classed by modern authorities.[2] It would however be impossible, by such expedients, to reduce it to any other form than that of a personal or autobiographical narrative. But it may safely be pronounced altogether foreign to the genius of the primitive epic muse that such a narrative should stand alone. In modern times the hero of a romance may, with, or even possibly without, the ceremony of a prefatory notice in the title-page, be introduced relating his history to an imaginary audience: but in an age to which scarcely an alphabetic letter, still less a written volume, is conceded, the supposition of a poet or rhapsodist, not content with telling his story in his own person, actually presenting himself to his audience in that of

[1] B. IX—XII.

[2] Wolf. Prol. p. 121.; W. Müll. Hom. Vorsch. ed. 1836, p. 101.

his hero, cannot for a moment be entertained. This series of adventures must, therefore, from the first have belonged to the body of narrative with which it is now connected. The rule obviously extends with still greater force to the subordinate cantos of the series. They may possibly be interpolations. But the notion of three or four such original independent specimens of personal narrative were still less admissible than that of a single one.

In the Odyssey however, as in the Iliad, it is even less perhaps in these bulkier heads of adventure, embodying standard points of national legend, that the mechanical unity of parts is displayed, than in a class of minor transactions which could hardly by any possibility be other than the personal invention of the poet. Attention may here again be directed to the easy artless manner in which the secondary actors are brought forward, dismissed, and reproduced, from time to time, often in widely separate portions of the drama. The names, for example, of three or four leading suitors, with the principal traits of their character, may have been matters of common tradition; but no such indulgence can be extended to the heralds, waiting-maids, goatherds, bards, beggars, and other petty performers, who all fulfil their respective functions with the same consistent unity as the protagonist himself. The following examples have been selected, among many perhaps still more to the purpose, as illustrating at the same time other features in the mechanism of the poet's art.

Voyage of Telemachus. Noëmon.

4. In the second book Telemachus, when about to sail for Pylos, after the refusal of the suitors to lend him a ship, procures one from a friend called Noëmon[1],

[1] II. 386.

otherwise unknown to fame, but who, in the fourth book, is again introduced as in want of his vessel, and anxiously inquiring[1] as to the period of its return. This circumstance is in itself somewhat strange. The wealth of the Ithacan royal family must have comprised ships, and it is nowhere implied that this particular portion of that wealth had been confiscated by the suitors, while the existing heir was left in possession of his lands, cattle, and other goods. To whatever cause the anomaly be due, it is not likely to have been consistently followed up by more than one poet. The borrowed ship is manned with volunteers selected by Mentor from the youth of the city. On reaching Ithaca, on his return from the voyage, the prince lands at his farm, and sends on his vessel to the port, commissioning Piræus[2], a confidential comrade, to take charge of his property, and protect during his absence a stranger of distinction, to whom he had afforded a passage from Pylos. We then leave the ship, and accompany Telemachus across the country to the cottage of Eumæus. After a long interval, in the latter part of the next canto, we rejoin the ship already in port, and are somewhat surprised to find the goods of Telemachus lodged, not in the house of Piræus to whose care they had been committed, but of another person called Clytius[3], of whom nothing had yet been heard. At the commencement of the seventeenth book, however, Telemachus on arriving in the town finds Piræus in the marketplace, who accosts him, and begs he will send servants from the palace to his (Piræus's) house, to receive the property lately lodged in it. Here then, on first view, there is a manifest discrepancy. In

Piræus Clytides.

[1] iv. 630. [2] xv. 540. [3] xvi. 327.

one place Piræus, in another Clytius, is made to take charge of the goods. The matter, however, is explained by reference to the passage where Piræus is first mentioned, and where the patronymic Clytides is added to his name. He was therefore, like Telemachus, a youth as yet unsettled in life, and resident with his father; his friend's goods are carried consequently, as a matter of course, to his father's house, which is afterwards familiarly described as his own. This artless chain of mutual connexion supplies evidence, both of original unity in the parts of the poem, and of an audience familiar with many minor details of the subject, the suppression of which might give trouble to a reader of an age some three thousand years removed. Had Homer, in the first address of Telemachus to Piræus, happened to omit his patronymic, as he might very naturally have done, this series of passages, which now so clearly evinces the unity of composition, would have been adduced as conclusive argument of patchwork.

Melanthius and Melantho.

5. The male representative of the rebellious vassalage of Ulysses is the goatherd Melanthius. The female ringleader of the same faction is Melantho [1], waiting-maid of Penelope. The correspondence of name and disposition naturally leads to suspect some blood relationship between the two. Nowhere however is there any notice to that effect on the part of Homer. It is only by collation of incidental passages, at widely distant intervals, that we are led to infer they are brother and sister. Melantho is described, in XVIII. 321., as the daughter of Dolius, head gardener and favourite servant of Laertes, and as having been educated by Penelope with great tenderness

[1] XVII. 212., et locc. supr. citt. in § 1.

for her own service, but now lost to all sense of shame or duty, and the mistress of Eurymachus. Melanthius is also styled son of Dolius; and, although it is nowhere said that this Dolius was the same person as the father of Melantho, the fact may be inferred from the circumstance of her paramour Eurymachus being also described as the patron of Melanthius, who accordingly occupies a place by his side when admitted to the table of the suitors.[1] The intimacy with the sister sufficiently explains the favour shown to the brother.

Theoclymenus the seer.

Piræus, the friend of Telemachus already noticed, has another bond of connexion with the body of the poem, through the medium of an important, though in some sense superfluous episode, that concerning the seer Theoclymenus[2], towards whom, in the absence of the prince, Piræus fulfils the duties of hospitality. Neither the first introduction of this stranger, the detailed genealogy of his race, nor his presence in the sequel, has the smallest necessary relation to the historical substance of the action. While it is not therefore very apparent, on first view, what may have induced even a single Homer to admit him at all, it is next to impossible that any number of independent authors or interpolators should have conspired in carrying his interference so systematically through the subsequent stages of the history. There suggests itself however, on closer consideration, a somewhat deeper motive than mere caprice, in the mind of the poet, for the prominence assigned to the mysterious refugee. Among the most valuable expedients for imparting supernatural effect to any great catastrophe was that of

[1] xvii. 257. [2] xv. 223., et locc. citt. in § 1.

prophetic agency. In the Iliad are several distinguished organs of the divine will; Calchas, Helenus, Polydamas. In Ithaca no such character is mentioned, with the exception indeed of Leodes, himself one of the suitors, and as such virtually disqualified for the office of warning his companions of their impending fate. Homer, therefore, has thought fit to introduce one from abroad; nor could a more appropriate selection have been made than that of Theoclymenus, who, as lineal descendant of the Argive Melampus, represents the most distinguished line of Hellenic soothsayers. He is ushered on the stage under circumstances replete with mystery and terror, fleeing the vindictive wrath attendant on one of those crimes from which even the noblest natures in unguarded moments are not exempt; and his presence and interposition become essential to the moral conduct of the plot. The contempt with which his warnings are received, and his brutal treatment by the suitors, while adding to the measure of their enormities, supply, as will be seen hereafter, material for one of the finest scenes of preternatural horror in the whole volume of descriptive poetry.

Pervading influence of Apollo.

6. A still more important illustration of the delicacy and depth of the poet's divine mechanism is contained in a series of allusions to certain mysterious peculiarities in the period and circumstances of the catastrophe of the poem. These allusions, taken separately, may appear little more than unimportant commonplaces or puzzling enigmas; but, in the true spirit of their epic connexion, they reflect in a new and brilliant light both the unity and the grandeur of the poet's genius.

Ulysses, soon after his return to his native island,

on two successive occasions, and in terms too solemn to be misunderstood, places the epoch of that return, and of the vengeance to be inflicted by him on the suitors, about the new moon; or, literally, "at the expiry of one month and commencement of another."[1] In the Greek religious calendar, the first days of the month were sacred to Apollo from the remotest period; and the Neomenia, or feast of the New Moon, celebrated in honour of that deity, continued to be one of the most popular festivals in every age of classical antiquity.[2] On the morning of the day destined for the destruction of the suitors, the fourth after the arrival of Ulysses, they appear earlier than usual in the palace hall. The reason assigned is, "that it is a great public festival,"[3] the feast of Apollo in fact, as stated a few lines afterwards, where the heralds are described as leading the victims in procession through the city, and the people as assembled in the Grove of Phœbus. Now it will be remembered that Apollo was, in the primitive mythology, and in that of Homer in particular, the god of sudden death[4]; and the bow, his favourite weapon, was the emblem of his destructive attributes. The bow was also the weapon with which Ulysses was to consummate his vengeance on the suitors. Hence the competition of archery with the hero's bow, appointed by Penelope the day before as a test of their prowess, is selected with ominous propriety as the gymnastic entertainment of the feast of the god. Mark then how impressive the combination.

[1] xiv. 162., xix. 307.

[2] Hesiod, W. and D. 770.; Herod. vi. 57.; Philoch. ap. Scholl. min. et Scholl. Buttm. ad Od. xx. 155., xxi. 258.

[3] xx. 156. 276.

[4] See infra, Ch. xi. § 5.

The light-hearted traitors, like moths playing round the flame of a candle, were destined, while in the act of honouring the god of the bow and of sudden destruction, on his own feast day and with his own weapon, to be suddenly destroyed by the bow of their injured sovereign. How fearful the self-irony of their unconscious appeals to the patronage of the very deity at whose altar they were about to be sacrificed! In order, however, rightly to apprehend the spirit of these mysterious forewarnings of the impending fatality, it will be proper to trace them as they occur dispersed throughout the latter half of the poem, and for the most part in the mouths of persons who seem to have no distinct consciousness of their import.

The disembarcation of Telemachus on the shore of Ithaca, with his inspired guest Theoclymenus, is greeted by the appearance of a hawk, designated "the swift messenger of Apollo," [1] tearing a dove to pieces, and strewing the feathers on the earth around the hero. This omen the seer emphatically pronounces to be significant of prosperity and power to the royal house of Ithaca. The allusion to the strewing of the bodies of its enemies by the weapons of the god, as the feathers of the victim had been scattered by his winged messenger, is abundantly obvious.

After the insult offered by the treacherous Melanthius to the disguised Ulysses on his walk to the city, Eumæus puts forth a prayer for the speedy return of his master, to curb and punish such brutal conduct. The goatherd scornfully retorts [2] with a wish, "that Telemachus were as sure of being smitten that day by Apollo in the palace hall, or of falling

[1] xv. 526. sqq. [2] xvii. 251. sqq.

by the hands of the suitors, as he is sure that Ulysses will never return to Ithaca." Now when it is remembered, that not only was Ulysses to return, the minister of his own wrath and that of the god whom the base peasant invokes, but that Melanthius himself was to be involved in the same speedy destruction as his licentious patrons, these few lines, which the careless reader passes over as mere matter of epic routine, will appear replete with ominous allusion to the impending catastrophe.

Penelope, in the course of the same day, hearing that Antinoüs had violated the rights of hospitality in her hall by striking her disguised husband, expresses a wish, in the warmth of her indignation, "that he himself might be stricken by the bowman Apollo:" XVII. 494.

αἴθ' οὕτως αὐτόν σε βάλοι κλυτότοξος Ἀπόλλων·

and the mode in which the old nurse emphatically follows up the invocation shows that it is pregnant with more than common import: 496

εἰ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρῇσιν τέλος ἡμετέρῃσι γένοιτο,
οὐκ ἄν τις τούτων γε ἐὺθρονον ἠῶ ἵκοιτο.

The queen wishes that "the archer Apollo" would destroy Antinoüs; Euryclea rejoins, that, "if *her* desire were fulfilled, not one of the suitors would see the morrow." Now the morrow was Apollo's day; and on it the suitors were destined to be slain by the bow. The nurse's answer therefore, while in its familiar sense merely expressing a wish for their speediest possible destruction, indirectly defines the period appointed for its accomplishment.

On the fatal day itself, Antinoüs, having vainly

attempted to string the bow of Ulysses, proposes to put off the contest until the close of the festival, and after prayer to the god for better success. Here, again, observe the portentous self-irony of some of his reasons: XXI. 258.

> νῦν μὲν γὰρ κατὰ δῆμον ἑορτὴ τοῖο θεοῖο
> ἁγνή· τίς δέ κε τόξα τιταίνοιτ';

"Who would pollute so pure a festival by feats of archery?" The disguised king commends this proposal, adding sarcastically, that doubtless on the next morning the god, if it be his good pleasure, will inspire them with fresh vigour for the undertaking; but in the meantime begs to be allowed a trial. In this request he is supported by Penelope, who promises that, should Apollo grant him success, his prowess shall not go unrewarded.[1] His petition is, however, scornfully refused by the suitors; and when Eumæus, in compliance with the queen's wish, is about to hand the weapon to the hero, Eurymachus, in his customary tone of scurrility, tells the faithful peasant that "he will make him food for his own swine." At length when Ulysses, bending the bow and shooting the arrow through the axe-heads, strips himself of his tattered disguise, and mounts the pavement of his palace hall ready to commence the bloody work, he utters the terrible sentence, that "he is now about to aim at a mark which no man yet hath hit, but which he hopes to pierce by the favour of Apollo:" XXII. 6.

> νῦν αὖτε σκοπὸν ἄλλον ὃν οὔπω τις βάλεν ἀνήρ,
> εἴσομαι αἴ κε τύχωμι, πόρῃ δέ μοι εὖχος Ἀπόλλων!

[1] XXI. 281.; conf. 338.

This whole train of allusions therefore, in a great measure pointless if taken separately, assumes collectively an awful significance as concentrated around the fatality, that Ulysses was suddenly to destroy the suitors with the bow, on the sacred day of Apollo, the god of archery and of sudden destruction. The catastrophe was to take place at the moment when they were assembled to celebrate, with their characteristic levity of demeanour, the festival of the god, and while engaged in a trial of skill with the weapon which, sacred to him, was to deal death to themselves; with the very weapon too, of the man they were outraging, and whose wife and plundered goods were the promised reward of the victor.

What however it may be asked, has induced the genius who conceived this grand poetical moral, to shroud it under so enigmatical a veil?[1] A sufficient answer to such questions might perhaps be, that we have no right to ask them. The following however suggests itself as a natural explanation of the mystery. The special patroness of Ulysses was Pallas. She had been his guardian angel during the Trojan war, and had conducted him safe through the dangers of his late adventurous course. To her therefore the first, and ostensibly the sole credit was to remain of completing the work she had begun.

[1] The fact of a coincidence between the catastrophe of the poem and the feast of Apollo has been observed by O. Müller (Einl. zu ein. Wiss. Myth. p. 360.): but, overlooking the whole train of delicate allusions to that coincidence, he has arrived at the strange opinion that Homer himself was unconscious of their spirit and value; that he is merely the mechanical organ of some obscure tradition, which he neither understood nor appreciated. The equally strange argument by which this view is supported, that the poet nowhere specially directs attention to the fact of Apollo being an agent in the destruction of the suitors, is sufficiently disposed of by the series of passages above cited.

Had the agency of Apollo been brought forward in the prominent form to which its importance might otherwise seem to entitle it, Minerva would have been eclipsed, or a multiplicity of divine interference have resulted, injurious to the harmony of the action. The influence therefore of the god of the bow, with its train of portentous contingencies, has been very properly kept in the background of the picture. The few incidental touches by which it has been shadowed forth speak home, through their very obscurity, with the greater force to the minds of those who appreciate the true spirit of the poem, but must remain a dead letter to such as read it on the principles of Hermann, Wolf, or Heyne.

CHAP. IX.

HOMER. ODYSSEY. UNITY OF THE ACTION. CHARACTERS.

1. COMPARATIVE GENIUS OF THE TWO POEMS. TRIPARTITE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ACTION OF THE ODYSSEY.—2. CHARACTER OF ULYSSES.—3. ITS DEGRADATION BY THE LATER ORGANS OF EPIC TRADITION. ITS COMIC INGREDIENT.—4. VOYAGE OF ULYSSES. THE CICONIANS. CHARACTER OF THE HERO'S COMRADES. THE LOTOPHAGI.—5. THE CYCLOPS. ÆOLUS. THE LÆSTRYGONIANS. CIRCE. THE NECROMANCY. THE SIRENS.—6. SCHERIA AND THE PHÆACIANS. NAUSICAA.—7. ALCINOÜS AND HIS COURT.—8. ULYSSES IN ITHACA.—9. CHARACTER OF TELEMACHUS.—10. HIS ORATORY.—11. CHARACTER OF THE SUITORS. ANTINOÜS. EURYMACHUS. AMPHINOMUS. LEODES.—12. ORATORY OF THE SUITORS.—13. THEOCLYMENUS THE SEER. IMPRESSIVE SCENE. THE CATASTROPHE.—14. PARALLEL CHARACTERS OF PENELOPE AND ANDROMACHE.—15. EUMÆUS THE SWINEHERD. MELANTHIUS THE GOATHERD. EURYCLEA. MELANTHO. IRUS THE BEGGAR. EURYLOCHUS. MENELAUS. NESTOR. HELEN.

Comparative genius of the two poems.

1. The fundamental difference in the genius of the two poems has been accurately pointed out by Aristotle.[1] The Iliad he defines as pathetic and simple; the Odyssey as ethic and complex. Our previous analysis of the plot of the Iliad, in conjunction with the character of its hero, has been accordingly little more than a commentary on the philosopher's concise and pithy definition. The whole machinery of that poem revolves around the single object of exemplifying, in the person of one great ideal being, the effects of those passions which, in poetry or real life, chiefly excite admiration or terror. The Odyssey is no less truly described, by the same critic, as a varied picture of character and manners. We must, however, guard against too rigid an interpretation of

[1] De Poet. xxv. ed. Bip.

the letter of this distinction. While the characters of the Iliad, from the comparatively limited nature of its subject, are confined to a limited class, they are perhaps on that account the more wonderful in the variety and delicacy of their conception. In the Odyssey, on the other hand, although the ethic element predominates, yet the individual displays of passion and feeling fall no way short, either in liveliness or truth, of those of the Iliad.

While therefore the Iliad, from the greater solidity and simplicity of its design, and the superior dignity of its subject and style, ranks as the nobler poem of the two, the Odyssey must be admitted to display a greater extent and fertility of inventive genius. Nowhere can a work of art be found combining so great a multiplicity of parts in so harmonious a unity of whole, or exhibiting in the treatment of so rich a variety of materials such masterly design or vivid colouring. In the raging of the storm, in the tumult of war foreign or domestic, it displays all the grandeur of the Iliad. In the terror of the giant or cannibal, the fascination of the siren, or the delusive arts of the sorceress, the bold fancy of Oriental romance is combined with the genial simplicity of Hellenic fable. In the spacious halls of the imperial palace, or the still seclusion of the landward farm, the reader feels equally at home; and partakes with equal zest of the cheerful frugality of the rustic board, and the gorgeous munificence of royal hospitality. He listens, as if present, alike to the fierce altercation and the familiar dialogue, to the song of the bard, the traveller's tale, and the scurrilous jest of the licentious brawler. He imagines himself as busily engaged in the daily routine of in-

door life, as in the bustle of the market, or the stormy debate of the council hall. In the passage of the vessel from coast to coast or island to island, we hear the flapping of the sail, the dash of the oar, and the cry of the mariner. We rejoice with the good ship as she glides over the waves before a prosperous breeze, and shudder for the fate of her gallant crew amid the tumult of warring elements. In the characters are exhibited, with the same unvarying truth and nature, the patient but dignified demeanour of rank and worth under grinding oppression; the heroic constancy of the devoted wife, amid endless trials and temptations; the unshaken fidelity of the affectionate husband; the modest simplicity of the ingenuous youth; the bold enterprise, cunning artifice, and stern endurance of the daring adventurer; the mixture of insolence and servility, squalid misery and rapacity, in the professional beggar and vagabond. The gravity of the sage, and the dry humour of the satirist, are contrasted with the levity of the frivolous courtier, the abandoned rake, or the giddy populace; the base treachery and ingratitude of the rebellious vassal, with the devotion of the faithful subject; the sportive coquetry of virgin innocence, with the wanton pertness of the courtesan; the deliberate villany of the heartless reprobate, with the vacillation of the half-repentant sinner. The Odyssey is, in fact, a rich picture gallery of human life as it existed in that age and country, embracing every subject, from the sublime to the ludicrous, from the terrible to the burlesque, with so close an adherence to nature, yet so careful a softening down of its more offensive features, as to charm as much by the purity as the truth and brilliancy of the representation.

Tripartite distribution of the action of the Odyssey.

This difference in the genius of the two poems involves a corresponding variety of their poetical structure. The Iliad hinges on a single all-absorbing interest, the excited passions of Achilles. In the Odyssey, besides the main scope of the narrative, the restoration of Ulysses to his kingdom, numerous separate interests present a proportional complication of underplot. Such are the private schemes of the suitors, and their persecution of Telemachus; the wrath of Neptune against Ulysses for his treatment of Polyphemus; and the love of Calypso for the same hero. Hence, while the fate of Ulysses, like that of Achilles, equally forms the centre of the action, the subordinate adventures acquire a far greater degree of separate integrity, and the persons who figure in them a more independent range of activity, than in the Iliad. While Ulysses is the hero of the whole poem, Telemachus is the protagonist of its first four cantos. Ulysses himself in his Apologue to Alcinoüs appears as the hero of a distinct action. Even the suitors assume, towards the close of the poem, a prominence which never belongs to any secondary performer of the Iliad. This difference in the composition of the Odyssey, while precluding any such concurrent analysis of the genius of the protagonist and of the whole work as in the case of the Iliad, renders it expedient here to follow out the same principle in detail, by examining each of the subdivisions above alluded to conjointly with the characters of their more immediate heroes. The whole action of the Odyssey may thus be ranged under three comprehensive heads: 1. The adventures of Telemachus alone; 2. The adventures of Ulysses alone; 3. The adventures of the two together, after their return

from their travels. The first claim on attention belongs to Ulysses, whose character, though graphically portrayed throughout his appearance on the stage, will be best considered in connexion with his exclusive occupation of it from the fifth to the twelfth books. The same series of narrative comprises also the court and people of the Phæacians, an episode offering one of the most spirited satires ever conceived on some of the more amusing weaknesses of human nature. The character of Telemachus connects itself in a similar manner with the opening books, where he figures as principal performer; while the suitors, Penelope, and other personages of inferior note, assume importance in the latter part of the poem.

Character of Ulysses.

2. The hero of the Odyssey also acts a leading part in the Iliad; but the remarks suggested by his share in that poem have been reserved for the present occasion, his character, in justice both to its own merits and the unity of the poet's conception of it, requiring to be considered as one consistent whole. It will also be proper to keep in view the relation in which Ulysses stands to the protagonist of the Iliad, as illustrative of the poet's tact in adapting the ingredients of each work to the spirit of its composition.

Achilles represents the grandeur of the heroic character, as reflected in the very excess of its noblest attributes. Ulysses represents its virtue, possessing, as he does in greater number and higher degree than any other chief, the qualities which in that age constituted the accomplished king and citizen. In him the impetuous valour of the invincible paladin gives place to the cool intrepidity of the discreet veteran. Instead of that intuitive horror of so much as the semblance of deceit which animates the

haughty Myrmidon, Ulysses combines with a just regard for the real principles of equity, a more rational estimate of the talents he had received from nature for promoting the legitimate objects of his ambition. To a ready turn for dissimulation and a never failing self-command, he unites a patient endurance of suffering, and even of insult, when essential to the attainment of his ends. In the Iliad, where his attributes of warrior and politician are alone exemplified, he is constantly put forward in those emergencies where a combination of courage and diplomatic tact is required. He is intrusted by Agamemnon with the delicate office of restoring Chryseïs to her home, and propitiating the wrath of the terrible deity to whom her father ministered. On the bad success of Agamemnon's experiment on the temper of his troops, and the bewilderment of that commander, Ulysses, with the aid of his guardian genius Minerva, restores order and discipline to the disorganised host. He takes the chief conduct of the negotiation with Achilles, and in the sequel, as representing the more intellectual element of military enterprise, he executes, in appropriate conjunction with Diomed's combative prowess, the midnight reconnoitre of the Trojan camp. He is also, conjointly with Diomed, an energetic opponent of Agamemnon's dastardly plans of desertion or flight.[1] In the games, baffling brute strength by dexterous art, he bears away from the mighty Ajax the prize of wrestling. This victory was but a prelude to that afterwards obtained in a more glorious competition with the same rival, when the voice of his fellow-warriors pronounced him the hero who, by his various talents,

[1] Il. xiv. 82.

had, next to Achilles, promoted the triumph of the national arms. The justice of this verdict was soon after tested, by his undertaking and successfully managing the stratagem of the wooden horse [1], the most dangerous, as it was the most decisive, measure of the war. On a former occasion [2] he had performed a little less hazardous exploit, that of entering Troy in disguise, for the purpose of obtaining cooperation among the inmates of the city in any attempt to take it by surprise.

Skilled however as he is in the arts of intrigue, he never turns them to unworthy account. The stratagems above referred to, with other parallel displays of political tact or patient endurance in the sequel of his career, are traits which, foreign as they would have been to the genius of Achilles, are appropriate and honourable in the hero of the Odyssey. His habitual prudence was indeed modified, or even at times overcome, by his thirst for glory, and by an eager pursuit of the marvellous which led him into perilous adventures. Proof against the temptation to sensual indulgence where to yield were discreditable, he displays no stoical contempt for the sweets with which fortune, in the worst of times, occasionally tempered the bitterness of his cup; and a ready vein of comic humour enlivens the gloom, while it seasons the description, of his most disastrous vicissitudes. But even the brilliancy of his intellectual qualities is obscured by his social excellences. He is not only the brave soldier, astute politician, and bold navigator, but the affectionate husband and parent, the just and paternal ruler, and the kind and benevolent master. Throughout his career of ad-

[1] Od. viii. 494., xi. 524. [2] Od iv. 242. sqq.

venture, the ruling objects of his thoughts or desires are still his wife, his son, and native fireside[1], in his own little sea-girt island, lowly and insignificant as he himself describes it[2], and as it would to this day have remained, but for the glory which his own and his poet's genius have shed on its rugged cliffs.

Its degradation by the later organs of epic tradition.

3. There is perhaps no hero whose character, as conceived by Homer, contrasts more broadly with the form it assumes in the fable of the Cyclic poets and the Attic dramatists. The valiant soldier is there transformed into the skulking poltroon, the sagacious politician into the plotting traitor, the man of honour into the low-minded villain. The critical reflexions suggested by this metamorphosis belong to another place; it will here suffice to observe, that there is nothing in the part played by Ulysses in either poem, which affords the slightest reasonable pretext for such imputations. He is not, it is true, exempt from the occasional weakness to which Homer, with a just regard for the laws of human nature, subjects even his most perfect characters. Yet his courage fails him but once[3], under all the trials to which it is exposed by land or by sea, and that before the arm of God rather than man, when not only Agamemnon and Menelaus, but Ajax and, with the single exception of Diomed, the whole Greek army, were infected with the same panic. There are however varieties of courage as of other human virtues. If Ulysses might, in such company, fly before Hector backed by the thunderbolts of Jupiter, Diomed, or even Achilles, might have displayed less composure in the cave of Polyphemus or the Shades

[1] Od. passim; Il. II. 260., IV. 354.
[2] Od. IX. 25. sq.
[3] Il. VIII. 78. sqq.

of Erebus, or have offered a less determined resistance to the temptations of hunger in the island of Thrinacia. Still less countenance is afforded by the Odyssey to the charges of the later fable against its hero's honesty. While the vicissitudes of his destiny render a succession of intrigues indispensable, yet on no occasion is an untruth uttered or a manœuvre practised for a base object, or where a man of strict honour and integrity, in any age or country, need have felt shame in turning his abilities to similar account.

Its comic ingredient.

With respect to the comic ingredient in the genius of Ulysses or of the Odyssey, the inquiry may suggest itself, how far, in a poem where the leading incidents are grave and serious, and the catastrophe deeply tragical, any such infusion of the burlesque be consistent with poetical propriety? The best general answer to this question is, that the operations of great original genius are scarcely compatible with an observance of those restraints to which the professional masters of the art, in later ages, have been subjected. A certain blending of the two ingredients seems also indispensable, on the principle of contrast, to the full effect of either the ethic or pathetic in such compositions. Even in the sublimely dignified Iliad many traits of humour are discernible. Such are the episodes of Thersites, and the scenes of domestic life in Olympus, to which, as of more questionable propriety, attention will be turned in treating of the theological mechanism of the poems.

In this respect the parallel is obvious between Homer and the two greatest poets of modern times, Dante and Shakspeare. The Hellenic minstrel

however as a general rule, excels his rivals, if not in the broader point of his comedy, in the propriety at least of its management, by making it season rather than rudely clash with more serious matters: and in one respect he stands nobly superior to them, that all obscenity is banished from his jest, or, if a vestige of such levity can be discerned, it is only through the veil of cautious and delicate enigma.

Judged by a more fastidious standard, the boxing match with the beggar Irus has objectionable features; yet, if the poet was justified in disguising his hero as a mendicant, he was bound to carry him through his part with spirit. Ulysses certainly appears as the prince of beggars; nor probably was his royal dignity tarnished, in the spirit of heroic manners, by the righteous chastisement inflicted on the base profaner of his palace hall. The transformation by Circe of the hero's navigators into hogs has also moved the spleen of critics of high authority.[1] But the fault may here lie in their too narrow estimate of the moral of the poet's romance. Such treatment, degrading as it may be to heroes of the Trojan war, is essential to the ethic spirit of the adventure. Lions or bears might have furnished a more dignified metamorphosis than hogs; but then the real point of the satire would have been lost. Their punishment is evidently adapted to their offence, the swinish eagerness with which they swallowed the intoxicating draught of the sorceress.[2]

The above general description of the hero's character will now be illustrated by the details of his

[1] Longin. ix. 14. [2] x. 237.; conf. 232.

history subsequent to his departure from Troy, as embodied in the action of the poem.

Voyage of Ulysses. Ciconians.

4. The "Apologue of Alcinoüs," whether in the variety or curiosity of its adventures, or in the brilliancy of their description, stands to this day unrivalled as a tale of supernatural wonder, the model on which succeeding romancers have planned their fairest structures, and the source to which they have been indebted for their choicest materials.

The superiority of native inspiration to imitative art may here be appreciated, by comparing the course of Homer's hero with the closely parallel episode of Virgil, the Voyage of Æneas to Latium. In the spirit that guides the Trojan chief no spark can be discovered of that electric fire which ought to animate the bosom of a chivalrous adventurer. Like an escaped prisoner who has yet but half shaken off his fetters, moaning over his cruel fate, he wends his melancholy way, shunning not merely every opportunity of valorous exploit, but even the remotest appearance of danger; trembling, above all, at the very thought of again falling in with those terrible Greeks! Compare more especially the outset of the two expeditions. Æneas lands on the coast of Thrace with the intention of founding a colony.[1] The limits of the new city were marked out, and its buildings in rapid progress, when he is apprised, through an omen, of the ferocious character of a neighbouring potentate, once an ally of Priam, but who had murdered a son of that monarch confided to his protection. What was to be done? In the spirit of Homer's fable he would at all risks have made

[1] Æneid. III. 13. sqq.

good his settlement, were it only to avenge the death of his kinsman on the perfidious assassin:

ἤτοι κεν πόλιν ἔπραθεν ὤλεσε δ' αὐτούς!

But no: terrified by the thought of so dangerous a neighbour, he at once abandons his half-built town, hurries on board, and takes to flight. How different is the first adventure of Ulysses on the same coast! As a whet to the courage of his handful of heroes at the commencement of their voyage, and a passing compliment to an old national enemy, he assaults, sacks, and plunders the city of these same Thracian allies of Priam.[1] The adventure would have been crowned with complete success but for the folly of his men. Deaf to his orders to reembark with the spoil, they remain carousing on the field, until swarms of kindred barbarians from the surrounding region collect and attack them; and it is only after a long and desperate conflict against overwhelming numbers that he succeeds in effecting his retreat. After this every thing is life, activity, and energy. When driven off his homeward course by the adverse elements, every new or strange country is visited, every wonder explored, every enterprise courted which held out a prospect of glory, or where conduct could insure success.

Character of the hero's comrades.

It will be observed, as a pervading rule of this whole train of adventures, supplying in its moral application a tribute to the virtue of the chief at the expense of the inferior order of intellect vouchsafed to his men, that while all the more brilliant and successful enterprises are undertaken at his instance, often against their will, every disastrous

[1] Od. IX. 39. sqq.

catastrophe is brought about by their folly, sensuality, or mutinous disobedience of his orders. The arm of retributive destiny is no less signally displayed in the issue of their respective careers. While the hero, in spite of infinite obstacles, reaches home in safety, not one of his unfortunate comrades escapes destruction; and for the reason concisely assigned by the poet:

αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο!

The Lotophagi.

On arriving at the country of the Lotophagi, two men with a herald are sent to explore. Partaking of the delicious diet of that hospitable race, they forget their friends and home, and resolve to pass the rest of their lives amid the delights of the "Land of the Lotus." Ulysses at once seizes and binds the delinquents, drags them to the beach, hurries them on board[1] with the rest of his crew, lest they too should taste of the intoxicating fruit, and hastens from the dangerous shore.

The Cyclops.

5. On reaching the coast of the Cyclops, the case is altered. The mariners, after plundering the well-stocked dairy of Polyphemus, horror-struck at the distant view of the giant, are eager to return with their booty to the ships. But the hero's thirst of glory is now inflamed, and must be gratified. He achieves accordingly the honour, reserved for him by the decree of Fate, of punishing a blood-thirsty cannibal, and disabling him from prosecuting in future his brutal practices. This adventure is still the best extant specimen of poetical gigantophonia, and the prototype of all or most of those which have since acquired celebrity. It exhibits that happy

[1] IX. 98.

mixture of the serious and burlesque, the terrible and risible, which constitutes perfection in popular romance. The more delicate of its humorous ingredients is the combination, in the character of Polyphemus, with his flocks, milk, butter, and cheese, of the primitive simplicity of pastoral life with the ferocity of the giant and cannibal.

Æolus.

The arrival of the fleet at the island of Æolus introduces a fable of more elegant cast and refined moral application. The Lord of the Winds, feasting with his twelve sons and daughters in the palace hall of his brass-bound islet, receives and honourably entertains the distinguished stranger; and, on his departure, deputes to him such control over the elements as would secure his direct and speedy voyage home. The mode in which these kind intentions are fulfilled is described with much drollery. The adverse gales are sewed up in the hide of one of their master's oxen, slaughtered and skinned on the spot for the purpose[1]; and so securely is their leathern prison bound with silver cords, that not a breath of unfavourable air could escape. Here again, the sordid sensuality of the mariners and its fatal results appear in the usual contrast with the virtue of their chief. During ten days he watches the progress of the vessel, the sleepless guardian of its airy cargo. On the tenth, overcome with fatigue, he slumbers, and their folly and avarice prevail. The moment selected for the opening of the bag is most appropriate; just as the culprits were within sight of the curling smoke of their native hearths, and anticipating the speedy enjoyment of the treasure which they supposed the mysterious wallet to contain. The winds, on their

[1] x. 19.

escape, as a seasonable reprisal on the author of their late durance, blow him straight back to their master's island. The account of his foolish appearance, on presenting himself again at the court of Æolus, has much dry comic humour. After inquiring the reason of so speedy a return, and listening quietly to the hero's explanation, his flatulent majesty sends him summarily about his business, as one whose inveterate ill luck, according to the familiar superstition of every primitive age, renders him an unfit object of countenance or sympathy.[1]

The Læstrygonians.

On reaching the port of the Læstrygonians, the rest of the squadron, attracted by its beauty and tranquillity, enter and take up their moorings. Ulysses alone remains with his vessel in the open roadstead, till better informed of the nature of the country by the messengers whom he sends to explore it. The description even of this most tragical adventure is seasoned with the customary touches of the burlesque, by the combination of domestic and civilised habits in the Læstrygonian character (as of pastoral simplicity in that of the Cyclops) with the ferocity of the giant and man-eater. The maiden whom the ambassadors accost on her way to the fountain, and who proves to be the king's daughter, with ready politeness conducts them to her father's city and palace, and introduces them to the queen her mother, whose "mountain-stature" and hideous aspect freeze their breasts with terror. The queen, as becomes a prudent housewife, takes no step without consulting her husband, whom she summons from the forum, where he was engaged in public business. On his arrival, without saying a word, he seizes one of his

[1] x. 72.

guests, kills him on the spot, and orders him to be dressed for supper. The two others save themselves by flight. But the alarm is given, and the adventure ends in the total destruction of the fleet in the haven. Ulysses alone, with his vessel and crew, escapes. The catastrophe is painted with the poet's usual power. He brings before our very eyes the collected population of ogres hurling the masses of rock from the surrounding cliffs; and we hear the crush of the vessels and the cries of the mariners, harpooned like tunnies for the evening meal of their cannibal destroyers.[1]

Circe.

The hero's next resting-place is the island of Circe. Here he divides his men into two bodies, who cast lots for the service of exploring the country. The lot falls on the party headed by his lieutenant Eurylochus. Its members, with the exception of their leader, who here emulates the caution of his chief, yielding to the allurements of the enchantress are changed by her into hogs. They are delivered by Ulysses who, aided by Mercury, here a plain figure of the hero's intellectual superiority, baffles Circe at her own arts, after checking with energetic severity a first attempt at mutiny on the part of the same Eurylochus.

The Necromancy.

After a year's residence on the island he achieves his voyage to Hades. From the narrative of this expedition every trait of the burlesque is judiciously excluded. The gaiety with which the royal adventurer had so lately recounted even his most calamitous vicissitudes gives place to a solemnity often rising to the sublime, in his description of the dismal

[1] x. 121.

terrors of the mansions of the dead. The consideration of the poet's doctrine of a future state, as embodied in this episode, belongs to the chapter on his mythology. Nowhere, perhaps, does the contrast between the Ulysses of Homer and the Ulysses of the later fable, between the high-minded fearless adventurer and the mean-spirited insidious manœuvrer, appear in a more prominent light than in the "Necromancy." The shade of Achilles himself expresses astonishment at the composure with which a solitary mortal wanders, without divine escort, among scenes of preternatural terror, at which even a living Achilles might have shuddered.

The Sirens. The adventure with the Sirens inculcates, in a beautiful allegory, the duty incumbent even on the most vigorous minds, not only to resist but to avoid temptation. The sage who exposes himself to its influence is here exhibited overcome by its power, and only escapes through the intervention of the same vulgar agents whom his own wise precautions had placed beyond its reach. But in his encounter with Scylla, his martial ardour overcomes his habitual forbearance; and the cruel destruction of two of his comrades, described by him as the most heart-rending of all his calamities, is admitted to be a judgment for his neglect of the divine injunction, to trust in this emergency not to his own valour, but to the protection of the gods, for deliverance. In the immediate sequel the insubordination and impiety of the crew, instigated as before by the mutinous Eurylochus[1], bring their own wanderings to a lamentable close, while the hero himself alone

[1] xii. 352.

escapes, at the expense of eight long years of banishment and captivity.

Scheria and the Phæacians.

6. On his delivery from the thraldom of Calypso, another course of maritime disaster brings him to Scheria, the land of the Phæacians. This episode is, perhaps, the most brilliant specimen of the poet's combined talent for the delineation of character and for satirical humour. While there is no portion of his works a right understanding of which is so indispensable to a full estimate of his genius, there is none perhaps which has been so little understood. Appeal may be made to the tenor of the most esteemed commentaries, still more perhaps to the text of the most popular translations, where the gay sarcastic tone of description and dialogue which seasons the whole adventure, is replaced by the tragic solemnity of the gravest scenes of the Iliad.

Whether Scheria is meant to represent a real or a fictitious country is a question which does not now immediately concern us. There can, however, be little doubt, from the distinctive peculiarities with which the poet has invested its inhabitants, and the precision and force of the sarcasm displayed in his portrait of their character, that the episode is intended as a satire on the habits of some real people with whom he was familiar.[1] The Phæacians are described as combining certain magical or supernatural attributes with a large share of human weakness. They were a maritime colony[2] which had migrated to Scheria from another distant shore, and are still, from taste and habit, rather than commercial zeal, extensively engaged in nautical enterprise. They are represented as wealthy and luxurious, devoted to

[1] See Append. E.

[2] VI. 4.

pleasure and diversion; careless of all but the present moment and its enjoyments; vain, garrulous, and ostentatious; liars and boasters; yet, withal, kind-hearted, good-humoured, and generous. But even their good qualities are subservient to their vanity. One chief inducement to their munificent treatment of strangers was, by their own avowal, the prospect of glory that would accrue to themselves on their praises being sounded by the wanderer on his return home.[1] Nor does the marked urbanity of the royal family, or of the graver members of society, afford a sufficient security to their guest from the roguish tricks of the populace, or the impertinence of the young nobles of the court.[2]

Nausicaa. The scene in which the hero is first introduced to his new friends is singularly pleasing and characteristic.[3] The dream of Nausicaa, the most charming of her nation and her sex, her conversation with her father, descent with her maidens to wash the family vestments at the river mouth, the nymphish sports with which they enliven their task, and their encounter with Ulysses, offer a beautiful picture of the antient simplicity of domestic manners, and of virgin innocence, vivacity, and tenderness. The hero's address to his benefactress, correctly characterised by the poet as "gentle and cunning," is precisely that mixture of delicate flattery and winning supplication best calculated to produce its effect on female sympathies. The portrait of Nausicaa, as sketched here and in the sequel with a few masterly touches, is the most excellent of its kind in either poem. It combines, in the most attractive form, and under such modifications as became her sex, the more favourable charac-

[1] VIII. 101. 241. 251. [2] VII. 15., VIII. 158. [3] VI. 24. sqq.

teristics of her native race, frankness, courtesy, and benevolence, with a due share of egotistic loquacity and innocent coquetry.

Alcinoüs and his court.

7. Minerva finds it necessary to escort the hero through the streets of the town to the royal residence, enveloped in a cloud to protect him from the impertinence of the populace. He is welcomed with a profusion of courtesies by the king, queen, and nobles assembled in the royal banqueting-hall. The harangues of king Alcinoüs, the type, like Priam, of his people, are made by the poet, in this and the following scenes, and with his usual dramatic skill, the instrument for developing the common genius of the race over whom the orator holds sway. The characteristics of his eloquence are egotism and self-laudatory bombast, balanced by an equal share of hyperbolical compliment to his guest, good-humour, diffuseness, and incoherent wandering from subject to subject, as vanity prompts the one, or levity dismisses the other. His first short speech, on recovering from the bewilderment into which the sudden appearance of a stranger of so dignified a presence had thrown himself and his company, displays at once the genius of the orator and of the society over which he presided. "If," says he[1], "our guest be a man, our business is, first by handsome treatment of him while among us, to banish care from his breast, and then to help him home to his native country. There let him take his chance of the lot the Fates have decreed him. But if he be a god come down from heaven to visit us, let the gods themselves look to the matter. For the gods as you know are our frequent companions, not only sitting in visible forms at our

[1] VII. 186.

tables, but familiarly joining us in our journeys and occasional walks; for we are, in fact, like the Cyclopes and Giants, their neighbours and cousins." The effect of this effusion is much enhanced by the caustic dryness of the hero's answer. Nor can there be a better proof how completely the spirit of this portion of the poem has been misapprehended, than the pompous solemnity by which the whole humour of the dialogue is supplanted in the popular modern paraphrases.[1]

In the sequel queen Arete, who during the harangue of her husband had been scrutinising the outward man of the stranger, for the women engross the chief share of the small stock of common sense allotted to the community, seasons the general levity of the discourse by asking him who and what

[1] VII. 208. The subjoined version of this address, with however little pretension to poetical elegance, may claim at least to embody, nearly to the letter, the ethic spirit and point of the passage, which disappear in the popular translations:

"Alcinoüs, judge better of my case;
No god am I, nor like the heaven-born race;
Nor outward form in me nor inward mind
Betoken aught surpassing human kind.
But if thou e'er hast known a mortal wight
Harassed, pursued, by Fortune's cruel spite,
Worn out in body, and perplexed in heart,
Of him in me behold the counterpart.
More I could tell of my disastrous fate,
And all I've suffered through celestial hate;
But let me sup, I prithee, though distressed,
By Belly's importunity hard pressed,
That ruthless despot of the inner man,
Whose stern behest dispute no mortal can.
Vexed though I be, borne down by many a grief,
Yet eat and drink I must for his relief;
All cares forego, and check the gushing tear,
Whilst I replenish him with wholesome cheer."

he was, and how he came by the clothes on his back, which she recognised as part of her family wardrobe. His answer to this question calls forth from Alcinoüs a severe reflection on his daughter's defective hospitality. The hero vindicates his fair benefactress by a gallant but glaring misstatement of fact.[1] Soon after, Alcinoüs, in the course of another turgid oration[2], incidentally makes offer to his still unknown guest of his daughter's hand in marriage, together with a handsome establishment, if he will consent to remain among them; but is careful to assume in the same breath, that the stranger's patriotism will never admit of his acceding to such an arrangement. He then congratulates Ulysses on his approaching passage home, vaunting the marvels of his own navy and the enterprise of his seamen, to whom the helm was useless, as his vessels knew their own way from port to port.

The next morning the Senate assembles to deliberate on the best mode of honouring the stranger. In the ensuing banquet, Alcinoüs gives an agreeable proof how much real politeness he combined with his levity, in the ready tact with which he checks his bard's song of the Trojan war, on observing how painfully it affected his guest.[3] This he does by a proposal to pass on to the gymnastic games, "in order," as he adds, "that the stranger, on his return, may inform his friends how greatly superior the Phæacians are to all other men in boxing, wrestling, and the like martial exercises." After some display by the young nobles Ulysses is invited to make a trial. He declines, on the triple plea of fatigue of body, anxiety of mind, and the privilege of a stranger.

[1] VII. 303.; see infra, p. 454. [2] 313. [3] VIII. 94.

His refusal exposes him to some impertinence from the young princes, one of whom taunts him with fear of the superior prowess of himself and comrades. Provoked to compliance, the hero sends a quoit far beyond the mark of their best men, and with a force which made the Phæacians "quail beneath its whirl." He then challenges them to produce a champion to match him in any other feat of strength or dexterity. Alcinoüs no way abashed evades the proposal, giving, with ready effrontery, the lie direct to his own just uttered vaunt, and a new turn to the whole affair. He now requests Ulysses to inform his friends on his return home[1], "that the Phæacians are a peaceful race, who make little account of boxing, wrestling, and the like martial exercises, but that they excel all other men in the arts of good living, and are the most skilful navigators, the swiftest runners, and the best singers and dancers in the universe." A show of the latter accomplishments then takes place. The song of the bard, the only approach to licentious description in the poem, is here so completely in character, and so essential to the spirit of the whole scene, as to supply strong argument against the otherwise plausible opinion of its being a later addition to the original text. On Ulysses complimenting his host on the performance of his sons, Alcinoüs turns with delight to his courtiers, and commending the hero as a man of sense and judgement, requests each of them to make him a handsome present. At the same time he orders the youth who had insulted him to apologise[2], and all obey with great good-humour and alacrity.

Among the richer specimens of the Scherian

[1] VIII. 251 [2] 387. sqq.

monarch's meandering eloquence is the harangue in which he requests Ulysses to relate his adventures, and explain more particularly "why he always appeared so much affected by any allusion to the Trojan war;" an event, he gravely adds, which, with the destruction of the human race it involved, "was ordained in order to supply the festive board with agreeable subjects of minstrelsy." Equally characteristic is his comment on his father's prophecy of the destruction that overhung his own city, from the divine jealousy of their maritime exploits: "so spake the old man, and the gods may fulfil his words or not, as they think fit:" VIII. 570.

Ὣς ἀγόρευ' ὁ γέρων· τὰ δέ κεν θεὸς ἢ τελέσειεν,
ἤ κ' ἀτέλεστ' εἴη, ὥς οἱ φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ.

The names given by the poet to his Phæacian heroes, with the notices of their origin or previous history, are all, directly or ironically, allusive to their favourite pursuits or their flighty ostentatious character.[1] Nausithoüs, the "swift navigator," founder of the state, was son of Neptune, by Peribœa, the "widely celebrated," daughter of Eurymedon, the "wide-ruling," king of the giants. This connexion of the good-humoured effeminate race with giants and Cyclops, the poetical types of barbarism and ferocity, is conceived in the finest spirit of irony. Nausithoüs had two sons, Rhexenor, "Crusher of men," and Alcinoüs, "Strong of intellect." The satirical allusion in the latter title to the levity and frivolity of its owner is sufficiently obvious. "Crusher of men" left an only daughter, Arete, the benevolent, literally the "exorable," who espouses her

[1] VII. 56. sqq.

uncle, Alcinoüs, the reigning prince. To her both Minerva and Nausicaa, with appropriate reference to her name and character, counsel Ulysses to address his supplication on arriving at the palace.[1] The remaining twenty names of noble personages are but so many ingenious compounds significant of maritime pursuit, with the exception of two, one of which, Laodamas, "subduer of the people," is but a modification of that of the owner's grandfather, the "crusher of men."

Among the specimens of primitive "mock heroic" in this episode, attention may be drawn to the simile of the lion, employed to illustrate the hero's first appearance before his benefactress Nausicaa; no figure can be less appropriate, if taken in a literal sense, or happier if considered as a travesty of the more dignified epic style.[2] The account of the gymnastic games, with the descriptive catalogue of the doughty Phæacian candidates, is also a burlesque paraphrase of parallel passages of the Iliad. The facetious spirit[3] of the adventure is maintained to the close. Laden with compliments and presents, the hero embarks in the evening, in a galley expressly fitted out for his service. Before daybreak the ship reaches the coast of Ithaca, where he is conveyed

[1] VI. 310., VII. 75. [2] VI. 136.

[3] The misapprehension of this spirit has throughout proved a stumbling-block in the path of many a profound commentator. Nitzsch's subtle inquiries, "*Why* Alcinoüs, on so short an acquaintance, should offer his daughter in marriage to Ulysses?" and "*Why* the Phæacians should have landed the hero asleep on his island?" with other similar questions, are but so many proofs how little this otherwise ingenious critic has understood the more characteristic features of the Odyssey. See Erklärr. Anmkk. zur Odyss. VII. 311. sqq.; and Plan u. Gang der Odyss., ibid. vol. II. p. 46. 50.

gently from the deck on his bed by the waggish crew, and deposited fast asleep[1], together with his goods, on his native rocks. On awakening he is at a loss to know where he is, when he is relieved from his embarrassment by the appearance of his divine patroness, Minerva.

Ulysses in Ithaca.

8. It is in the latter part of the poem that the higher ethic attributes of Ulysses are chiefly displayed; in the conduct of his deep-laid plot; in his stoical command of temper and feeling under the trials to which both are exposed from the brutality of his enemies or the affection of his friends; and in his skilful enactment of the fictitious characters which he assumes. Attention is especially due to the care with which, in his part of beggar or vagabond, he guards against too great a sacrifice of his personal dignity, as well as the risk of detection, by giving prominence to the circumstance of noble birth and reduced condition, when called upon from time to time for an account of his previous life.[2] That the language of Ulysses should be marked by the same distinctive individuality as that of some of his fellow heroes were consistent neither with the versatility of his genius, nor the variety of parts he is called upon to act. The characteristic feature of his eloquence is an appropriate adaptation to the circumstances in which he is placed. Like the fabulous Lycian sphinx, which combined the nature of the lion and serpent with its own proper body of Chimæra, Ulysses, whether the king, the beggar, the warrior, or the traveller, is still in word and deed Ulysses. In the Iliad he speaks and acts as the wise counsellor, the energetic

[1] XIII. 119. [2] XIV. 199. sqq., XVII. 419., XIX. 180.

disciplinarian, and the skilful diplomatist. In the indignant retorts provoked by the insolence of the suitor tribe, his eloquence assumes a vehemence worthy of Achilles.[1] His address to Nausicaa is in the most insinuating style of courtly flattery. In the banqueting-hall of her father a tone of sarcastic raillery is blended with the self-satisfied bombast of its habitual guests; as, for example, in the proud catalogue of his own athletic attainments, with which he overwhelms the already crestfallen party in the gymnastic arena.[2] In his interview with Pallas on the shore of Ithaca, he calls forth the admiration even of the goddess of stratagem, by the readiness with which he disguises the struggle of excited feelings under the ingenuous bewilderment of the benighted voyager[3]; and in the hut of Eumæus, accommodating his manners to those of his landlord, he combines the garrulity of the veteran soldier with that of the itinerant beggar.[4]

TELEMACHUS.

Character of Telemachus.

9. The character of Telemachus, if little distinguished by the prominence or the brilliancy of its features, is second to none of either poem in the delicacy of its shades or of the touches by which it is delineated. To be rightly estimated, it must be considered in its parallel with those of other youthful heroes of the same rank; with that of Achilles, for example, or of his son Neoptolemus. The former hero, at the outset of his career of conquest, was several years younger than Telemachus. Neoptolemus is also described, at the same early age with his father, as taking a lead, both in the council and the field, among the Greek warriors; while Telema-

[1] xviii. 376. [2] viii. 202. sqq. [3] xiii. 256. [4] xiv. passim.

chus is represented as without energy, shy of danger, and incapable of spontaneous action or exertion. Herein may perhaps be figured the first symptoms of that degeneracy, mythical or real, in the race of Achæan warriors subsequent to the Trojan war, which, coinciding in the third generation after that event with their expulsion from their native seats by the Dorians, forms the line of distinction between the heroic and the historical age of Greece. That the falling off was understood by Homer to commence in the immediatcly ensuing stage of descent is implied in a speech of Nestor, whcre he remarks on the Ithacan prince's want of spirit: II. 276.

> παῦροι γάρ τοι παῖδες ὁμοῖοι πατρὶ πέλονται,
> οἱ πλέονες κακίους. . . .

In fact, with the single exception of Neoptolemus, not one of the sons or immediate descendants of the heroes of Troy is celebrated, in popular tradition, for warlike genius. The suitors, as sprung from the secondary class of Achæan nobles, are altogether an inferior race. Neoptolemus, being himself within the age which admitted his taking part in the war, might be numbered rather to the contemporaneous than to the subsequent generation. There are however special peculiarities in the case of Telemachus, tending to explain and palliate his inferiority. Deprived in infancy of a father's tuition, he had been educated within a small island, among objects calculated to inspire a taste for tranquil life, by an anxious mother, herself of a gentle disposition, and far more feelingly alive to the dangers to which warfare exposed her objects of affection, than to the glory of success or victory. On approaching manhood he

became, with herself, victim of a conspiracy of his father's vassals, by whose systematic oppression whatever spirit he inherited from his ancestors was for a time effectually subdued. Hence, though at heart a noble and generous youth, he appears, up to the moment when his father's return elicits his dormant energies, as remarkable for langour and backwardness as were the youthful heroes of the Trojan war for precocity and spirit.

During the early part of his career therefore, our compassion for his painful lot is mingled with surprise and irritation, that a prince of some twenty years of age should tamely suffer, not himself alone, but his mother, to continue the victim of a base faction, without so much as meditating an effort for her deliverance. One feels provoked to exclaim, as Nestor and his other friends frequently do: Why does he not put his own shoulder to the wheel, instead of querulously longing for his father's return to make good his inactivity? Why does he not rally his own party in the state against the rebels? Why limit his Peloponnesian expedition to a fruitless inquiry after Ulysses, instead of asking from his powerful friends in that country a military force to assist in subduing his treacherous enemies? One evident motive with the poet for thus diluting the character of his youthful hero was to enhance the glory of the father, whose destinies and influence are made the sole pivot on which the fortunes of his kingdom and family depend. Telemachus in fact, from the commencement of his domestic troubles, had been led by his mother to look for his father's eventual reappearance as their only sure, though postponed remedy. This consideration also explains the sudden change which

his character seems to undergo on the arrival of Ulysses, into whose daring schemes he enters with ready devotion.

His oratory.

10. Here, as usual, the poet's mode of delineation is purely dramatic. He vouchsafes not a word of description, burthening the youthful hero with the whole duty of exhibiting his foibles through his own language and behaviour. He is first introduced sitting in his paternal hall, an unwilling partaker in its festivities, and "brooding with sad heart on his disappointed hopes of his father's arrival to scatter the audacious crew." Minerva, in the disguise of a stranger chief, an antient friend of Ulysses, appears at the door, and is received by the prince with prompt hospitality. His recapitulation, in a tone of querulous helplessness, of his woes, of his longing for his father's return, and of his despair of doing anything for himself, moves the spleen of his divine guest, and draws forth a smart reflexion on his degenerate spirit: I. 252.

τὸν δ' ἐπαλαστήσασα προσηύδα Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη·
ὤ πόποι! ἦ δὴ πολλὸν ἀποιχομένου Ὀδυσῆος
δεύῃ. . . .

Urging him in the sequel to avenge his own cause, she taunts his boyish inactivity by a contrast with the different conduct of Orestes: 296.

οὐδέ τί σε χρὴ
νηπιάας ὀχέειν· ἐπεὶ οὐκέτι τηλίκος ἐσσί!
ἦ οὐκ ἀΐεις οἷον κλέος ἔλλαβε δῖος Ὀρέστης
πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, ἐπεὶ ἔκτανε πατροφονῆα; . . .
καὶ σὺ, φίλος, μάλα γάρ σ' ὁρόω καλόν τε μέγαν τε,
ἄλκιμος ἔσσ'! . .

He is induced by her remonstrances to assemble the great council of the island, and solicit the public sanction to his proposed voyage to Peloponnesus. His address to the assembly opens in a spirited tone of invective against the usurpers of his rights, but speedily subsides into the usual strain of lamentation over his juvenile incapacity, which here assumes a very characteristic tone of querulous petulance: II. 58.

οὐ γὰρ ἔπ' ἀνήρ,
οἷος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκεν, ἀρὴν ἀπὸ οἴκου ἀμῦναι· . . . .
ἦ τ' ἂν ἀμυναίμην, εἴ μοι δύναμίς γε παρείη. . . .
νῦν δέ μοι ἀπρήκτους ὀδύνας ἐμβάλλετε θυμῷ.
ὣς φάτο χωόμενος, ποτὶ δὲ σκῆπτρον βάλε γαίῃ,
δάκρυ' ἀναπρήσας. . . .

His introduction to Nestor is an agreeable picture of the bashful ingenuous youth, suddenly finding himself, on first setting out on his travels, in the presence of one of the most illustrious sages of Greece.[1] In his intercourse with the Pylian chief the same morbid diffidence of his own powers is expressed in the same complaining tone which marked his late dialogue with Minerva. Nestor, like the goddess, is surprised that a fullgrown youth, son of such a father, with the example of Orestes before him, and backed by the patronage of Pallas, should tamely put up with oppression and insult; and counsels him to a bold attempt, by his own resources, to reestablish his affairs.[2] Telemachus is quite bewildered by the magnitude of the proposal, and exclaims: III. 226.

ὦ γέρον, οὔπω τοῦτο ἔπος τελέεσθαι ὀΐω·
λίην γὰρ μέγα εἶπες! ἄγη μ' ἔχει![3] οὐκ ἂν ἔμοιγε
ἐλπομένῳ τὰ γένοιτ', οὐδ' εἰ θεοὶ ὣς ἐθέλοιεν.

[1] III. 22. [2] III. 195. sqq. 212. sqq. [3] Conf. XVI. 243.

This speech provokes the disguised goddess again to denounce the want of spirit, which would distrust not only his own but the divine exertions in his cause. He replies by a request that the subject may be changed: 240.

> Μέντορ· μηκέτι ταῦτα λεγώμεθα, κηδόμενοί περ· . . .
> νῦν δ' ἐθέλω ἔπος ἄλλο μεταλλῆσαι καὶ ἔρεσθαι.

Ulysses himself, in his mendicant disguise and as yet unrecognised by his son, utters an equally energetic reproof of his unmanly backwardness: XVI. 99. sqq.

> αἲ γὰρ ἐγὼν οὕτω νέος εἴην τῷδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ . . . .
> αὐτίκ' ἔπειτ' ἀπ' ἐμεῖο χάρη τάμοι ἀλλότριος φώς,
> εἰ μὴ ἐγὼ κείνοισι κακὸν πάντεσσι γενοίμην.

From the moment however in which Ulysses discovers himself, the dormant energies of the young hero are rapidly developed, and he ardently co-operates in all his father's hazardous schemes.

In his intercourse with the suitors he shows that, with all his youthful diffidence and timidity, he combined also some of the political talent of Ulysses; and the mode in which the social relations between his oppressors and himself are maintained, with the mutual care to preserve amid mutual hatred a certain outward show of harmony, may be cited among the examples of Homer's tact in working up the details of his plot.[1] The suitors, though barefaced usurpers of their prince's house and goods, are still anxious to be so in the capacity of his own and his mother's guests. They continue therefore, even in outrage and insult, to pay a sort of formal deference to him as landlord. Telemachus, on his side, shows

[1] XVII. sqq.

an equally cautious discretion, and, with an occasional remonstrance, is yet contented to fulfil the part of host in the mortifying farce. Almost the only provocations which tempt him to menace open rupture, are the brutal violations of the sacred rites of his domestic hospitality committed by the crew of revellers.[1] The suitors on these occasions, partly from policy partly from contempt, pocket the affront; and in this way the same insolence is successively checked, and the rebuke successively submitted to, each party avoiding to come to extremities.

THE SUITORS.

Characters of the suitors.

11. The characters of the suitors offer a variety of the poet's dramatic art peculiar to the Odyssey, that of portraying the more odious features of human nature. In the disposition and habits of this confederacy, the levity of men of pleasure is combined, not, as in the case of the Phæacians, with good-humour and generosity, but with insolence, profligacy, rapacity, and cruelty. They may be considered as representing a class of society with which Homer was still familiar, though gradually becoming obsolete, the race namely of petty tyrants, unworthy scions of heroic stock, whose degenerate habits accelerated the downfall of the old patriarchal system, and the change throughout Greece from monarchal to republican institutions.

The proceedings of the fraternity, amid an indiscriminate course of outrage against all others, are marked by a singular degree of harmony among themselves. Yet the individual members of the gang present much diversity of character. The "ring-

[1] xx. 265. sqq. 306.

leaders,"[1] Antinoüs and Eurymachus, are the worst of the whole, and ready, should it seem expedient, to shed the blood of their young prince as remorselessly as they ravage his property. They are the chief spokesmen, and organs consequently of that vein of scurrilous drollery which marks the habitual demeanour of the party. In their joyous festivities, their solemn councils, or their murderous plots, every thing becomes matter of jest, often with a lively wit, which though it may offend does not fail to amuse. This combination of waggery and brutality, of ferocity and fun, so characteristic of the same class of persons in every age, is carried through with a tact and consistency bespeaking the same master-hand which gave life to the more pleasing frivolities of the Phæacians. The character of the two leaders, in addition to other odious vices, is stained with base ingratitude. Ulysses, as they themselves admit, had been to them and their families, not only a paternal sovereign but a kind patron and benefactor.[2] These sacred obligations are however not merely set at nought; like all other subjects they are made matter of ridicule in those ironical professions of friendship with which they attempt, or rather affect, to blind Telemachus to their more outrageous schemes. Detestable as are both characters, there is yet a marked difference in the mode in which their wickedness displays itself, favourable on the whole to Antinoüs. He is, from first to last, the open, reckless, unblushing villain. Eurymachus combines more deceit and hypocrisy with his depravity, and occasionally succeeds in so far disguising it under the mask of better feelings, as partially to impose on both mother and

Antinous. Eurymachus.

[1] iv. 629., xxi. 187. [2] xvi. 424. sqq. 437. sqq.

son. These different shades of villany in the two leaders are maintained with unvarying consistency throughout the action of the poem.

Amphinomus.

Such unmitigated depravity, however, was not to be expected in the whole of so numerous a band of young noblemen even of the most licentious habits. Others, of whom Amphinomus[1] may be considered the representative, are exhibited as susceptible of better influences; and, although led away by the pernicious party spirit which animates the fraternity, to acquiesce or to share in the nefarious counsels of their leaders, are ready at times to check the execution of their more atrocious designs. A third class may also be distinguished, of whom Liodes[2] is the spokesman, comprising mere passive well-intentioned suitors of the queen, whose crime consists chiefly in their connexion with such bad company, and who, though unwilling to abandon their chance of the prize, would, if left to themselves, have been contented honourably to compete for it.

Liodes.

These general remarks on the genius of the association will now be tested by the portions of the text in which it is most prominently exemplified.

Oratory of the suitors.

12. The first speech of Antinoüs[3] affords a fair specimen of his style of satirical bantering, often pregnant with a savour of wit worthy of a better mouthpiece. Telemachus had been emboldened by his interview with Minerva, to a remonstrance of no very sturdy nature against the usurpation of his domestic rights. The reply of Antinoüs is an ironical sneer at the weak points of the prince's character, couched in the form of a complaint of his

[1] xvi. 394., xviii. 395. 412., xx. 245.

[2] xxi. 144., xxii. 310.

[3] i. 384.

domineering spirit, habitually renewed in the sequel. It concludes with a burlesque petition to the gods, "to avert the day when such a sovereign as Telemachus should mount the throne of Ithaca!"

The mock farewell of the party to Telemachus, previous to the voyage which they never suspect he will have the boldness to undertake, is in the same style of insolent drollery. The epithets of overbearing, insulting, and the like (ὑψαγόρη, μένος ἄσχετε, ἠμέας αἰσχύνων), which here, as on other occasions, they ironically select in their addresses to him, are precisely those which least apply to his conduct and most pointedly to their own.[1]

In the council held after the failure of their plot to waylay and murder the prince on his voyage homeward, Antinoüs proposes another attempt on his life. Amphinomus objects, and the argument by which he dissuades them is very characteristic:[2] "To murder a prince of royal blood, without the express authority of the gods, were a terrible impiety. If therefore the gods enjoin the deed, I shall agree, otherwise I protest against it." In the ensuing dialogue between Penelope and Eurymachus, that prince of ruffians, at the very moment when he is plotting against the life of her son, declares, that "should any man venture to raise a hand against his dearest friend Telemachus, the son of the benefactor who had so often dandled him on his knee, and fed him with wine and dainties, that man's blood should flow in torrents from his spear!"[3] The whole following scene is admirably worked up, and, amid our disgust at the brutality of

[1] II. 85. 303—325., I. 385., XVII. 406.
[2] XVI. 400.; conf. XX. 244. 247.
[3] XVI. 436. sqq.

Antinoüs, it is impossible not to be amused by the humour of some of his sallies. Such, for example, is the mock lecture which he administers[1] to Eumæus, when the latter introduces Ulysses in mendicant disguise to solicit a few crumbs from their table, on the inconsistency of the old rustic's conduct in thus bringing in hungry vagabonds to consume his master's store, the very same thing for which he was in the habit of blaming himself and comrades. He soon after assails the disguised king in a similar tone of facetious insolence. Ulysses is provoked to retort. Antinoüs in a fury throws a stool at his head. Even his fellow-revellers are scandalised at their leader's violence, and interfere to prevent further outrage. The calm indignation and stern purpose of vengeance, on the part of the hero and his son, are here finely contrasted with the surrounding tumult, in one of those expressive formulæ with which the poet loves to identify the recurrence of any striking image: XVII. 490.[2]

οὐδ' ἄρα δάκρυ χαμαὶ βάλεν ἐκ βλεφάροιϊν,
ἀλλ' ἀκέων κίνησε κάρη, κακὰ βυσσοδομεύων.

In the next book the entrance of the beggar Irus ushers in another equally vivid scene of brutal fun and riot. The puerile delight with which the giddy crew hail the quarrel between their two ragged guests as a novel source of diversion, and their alacrity in ranging themselves as backers or bottle-holders of the combatants, are described with a spirit and truth which must strikingly recall to many a reader the follies of his own schoolboy days: XVIII. 36.

[1] XVII. 375. [2] Conf. 465., XX. 184.

ὦ φίλοι! οὐ μέν πώ τι πάρος τοιοῦτον ἐτύχθη,
οἵην τερπωλὴν θεὸς ἤγαγεν ἐς τόδε δῶμα!
ὁ ξεῖνός τε καὶ Ἶρος ἐρίζετον ἀλλήλοιϊν,
χερσὶ μαχήσασθαι! ἀλλὰ ξυνελάσσομεν ὦκα.
ὡς ἔφαθ'· οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀνήϊξαν γελόωντες. . . .

When the unfortunate beggar is actually stretched bleeding and bellowing on the floor, their merriment is at its height, and "they are ready to die with laughter." Ulysses, who has so much contributed to their diversion, before despised and insulted, is now suddenly admitted into a high degree of favour, which however serves but as a prelude to fresh insult.

Here the farcical tenor of the proceedings is relieved by an impressive scene. Amphinomus had good-humouredly presented the royal mendicant with a cup of wine, adding kind wishes for his future lot. Ulysses, aware of the better feelings of this misguided youth, addresses him in return a friendly remonstrance on the guilt of his present courses, warning him emphatically to flee from the wrath to come. Though deeply smitten by the words of his disguised lord, the ill-starred vassal yet wants strength of mind to break the ties which bind him to the scene of his destruction, but, "shaking his head and foreboding evil," he silently resumes his place among his fellow-victims.

It is now the turn of Eurymachus to take the lead in the course of facetious scurrility and insult, of which Ulysses continues the chief butt, in order, as we are frequently told, "that the full measure of their crime, and his indignation, may be completed against the approaching hour of retribution." This interference of the divine agency is expressed, from

time to time, by the recurrence, according to the poet's familiar practice, of the same emphatic form of words: XVIII. 346.

> μνηστῆρας δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἀγήνορας εἶα Ἀθήνη
> λώβης ἴσχεσθαι θυμαλγέος, ὄφρ' ἔτι μᾶλλον
> δύῃ ἄχος κραδίην Λαερτιάδεω Ὀδυσῆος.[1]

There is here a plain analogy between Homer's mode of subjecting the moral conduct, as well as the destiny of his actors to the control of the deity, and the mode employed by a still more divinely inspired poet. The "hardening of Pharaoh's heart," for a similar purpose, is expressed by the recurrence of a parallel form of expression.

Theoclymenus the seer. Impressive scene.

13. In the banquet of the following day, Theoclymenus the prophetic guest of Telemachus is introduced, and his part in the action relieves the prevailing course of revelry by an appalling scene of preternatural terror.

Ulysses had just been subjected to another practical joke by Ctesippus, to the high entertainment of the party, when the merriment on their faces is suddenly, by the agency of Pallas, "distorted into a ghastly grin. Their eyes fill with tears; their minds with forebodings of a yet dark but terrible future; and the flesh of the animals on which they are feasting appears dripping with gore."[2] Theoclymenus here takes up the word, and, pointing to the outward change on their persons, proclaims the further omens of their impending fate which, though hidden from their eyes, his spirit of second-sight revealed to his own: "their heads and feet involved in preternatural darkness; wailing and lamentation

[1] Conf. xx. 284., XVIII. 155.

[2] XX. 345. sqq.

resounding from their lips; their cheeks streaming with tears, and the walls and roof of the hall with blood; the courts of the palace crowded with ghosts hurrying down to Erebus; the sun darkened in the heavens, and the atmosphere overspread with mist." Eurymachus, who with his companions had in the meantime resumed his previous levity of demeanour, replies in the usual strain of facetious contumely, by ordering the attendants to "conduct the stranger into the open street, since he is so much incommoded by the darkness of their saloon." The prophet calmly replies: "that he has no need of escort; that the eyes which could see, and the mind that could apprehend, the signs of their approaching fate, will safely conduct him from a place so soon to be filled with death and horror." He thus takes his final leave of the scene of action. The revellers, nothing abashed, commence bantering Telemachus on the offensive character of the guests who visit his palace: "first a beggar, and then a croaking prophet." The prince, no longer heedful of their impertinence, sits watching his father's eyes and motions for the signal to commence the work of vengeance.

The catastrophe now rapidly approaches. The trial of archery ensues. The jollity of the victims is kept up to the last moment. The first blow falls on Antinoüs, while holding the festive cup to his lips[1] unconscious of danger. It strikes him in the throat, the organ of his gluttony and insolence, when in the act of swallowing the produce of his destroyer's vineyards. His companions, on seeing him fall, unable to believe there could be willing mischief in the shot, suppose it accidental. No

The catastrophe.

[1] xxii. 11.

sooner, however, are their eyes opened by the hero's full disclosure of his person and intentions, than the surviving ring-leader Eurymachus, with dastardly effrontery, attempts to exculpate himself and propitiate the wrath of his enemy, by denouncing his fallen colleague as the chief author and instigator of their joint enormities, and by submissive promises of repentance and future good conduct.[1] Perceiving however all hope of mercy to be vain, he dies at last like a scion of heroic stock. Rushing on his adversary with drawn sword and battle shout, he is met and pierced by the fatal shaft, and his body is soon buried under heaps of his slain comrades.

PENELOPE. ANDROMACHE.

Parallel of Penelope and Andromache.

14. The two heroines selected by Homer as the joint representatives of ideal excellence in female character, the one for the Iliad the other for the Odyssey, are Andromache and Penelope. The qualities of each are fundamentally the same; gentleness, modesty, and tenderness of heart, womanly discretion, and the several virtues of the wife and mother. The native purity of Homer's taste has been signally displayed, in thus excluding from the qualities of his higher class of female characters such as at all savour of masculine spirit. The attempts, so popular with later poets, to form an interesting heroine by combining the boldness of the virago with the softer graces of the woman, may impart vivacity to an action deficient in more genuine portraits of human nature, but can inspire the sound critic or moralist with little sympathy or admiration. It can hardly be supposed that originals for such pictures as

[1] xxii. 44. sqq.

Camilla or Clorinda were wanting in an age when the traditions of Hippolyta and Penthesilea were rife, and among a nation which produced the race of Spartan dames. Homer therefore, it is obvious, has, in the conception of his leading female characters, repudiated these bolder features from choice, not from want of opportunity for their delineation. That this correspondence in the essential attributes of the two heroines arises from no want of the same fertile talent displayed in his male portraits may also be evinced by a glance at the varied characters of Helen, Nausicaa, and Hecuba. Upon the last has been bestowed the small share of masculine sternness which he allows the sex: but even in her person, where it sits so well, it is meant to appear as a blemish, not as an ornament.

The poet has however managed, even in the case of Penelope and Andromache, without any essential modification of his original idea, to impart, through the difference of their lot in life, distinct features of interest to each. The part of Andromache, in the Iliad is one of suffering rather than action. At the commencement of the poem she is the anxious and devotedly affectionate wife, in the catastrophe the mourning widow. The only strong emotions she is called on to display are, tender solicitude for the welfare of her husband and poignant grief for his loss. Her appearances, too, on the scene are rare and brief. Yet there is, perhaps, no heroine in the whole range of poetical fiction who inspires more powerful feelings of admiration and interest; a fine proof of the poet's faculty of imparting life and reality to his actors with the smallest apparent amount of machinery. How striking is her first

appearance on the scene! Hearing in the seclusion of her chamber that the tide of battle had turned against her husband, she hurries forth "like one distracted," [1] followed by her nurse and infant child, to the tower that overlooks the plain. The ensuing interview with Hector, whom she encounters returning to the field on completing his pious errand; her allusions to her previous heavy load of domestic sorrow; to the loss of her father, brothers, and native home, to her husband as supplying the place of all; her supplication, by his love for her and their common offspring, to moderate his valour, and have mercy on a life so dear to every thing most dear to himself, are all of the last degree of tenderness. How beautiful the description of her smiling through her tears, as she receives back the unconscious babe from his father's caresses into her arms; and of the mute suppressed emotion with which, yielding to Hector's gentle reproof for her attempt to weaken the firmness of his patriotism, she submissively retires to indulge her anxieties in solitude! Nor throughout the distressing scenes at the close of the poem, in her outbreak of agony on beholding her husband's corpse mutilated and outraged beneath his native walls, or in her touching lament over it in the sequel, is the meek affliction of this most innocent and sensitive of sufferers alloyed by a single expression of anger or bitterness, even against the hand which had successively bereaved her of father, mother, brother, and husband. Had Andromache combined but a small share of the sternness of the Spartan wife or mother with her anxieties for the safety of Hector, had she uttered a few natural ejaculations of vin-

[1] Il. vi. 388.; conf. xxii. 460.

dictive wrath against his destroyer. the charm which renders her the most angelic and interesting of her sex would at once have been dissolved.

There is this difference in the fate, and by consequence in the conduct of Penelope, that, while Andromache is merely doomed to suffer, the heroine of the Odyssey, under little less severe misfortunes, is also called upon to act. There is however also the somewhat curious analogy, that in each case the all-engrossing objects of solicitude are a husband and an only son. Although the love of Penelope for Ulysses, and her grief for his loss, are as lively as on the day of his departure, she begins to despair of his return. As hope grows fainter from hour to hour, the necessity of some effort to establish her son in his rights forces itself more and more on her attention: but far from encouraging him to resort to violent measures against the usurpers, her great object is to prevent such dangerous schemes from entering his head. If but once assured of the death of Ulysses, she is even ready to offer herself a sacrifice at the altar of peace, by selecting a second husband from the ranks of her persecutors.[1] If she occasionally gives way to expressions of indignation against her unmanly courtiers, they are rarely if ever provoked by her personal sufferings, but solely or chiefly by the wounds inflicted on the honour of her husband or family. In the absence of her lord, the deference due to him is transferred to Telemachus, now arrived at the age which qualified him to inherit his father's rights both public and domestic. The more prominent examples of her implicit acquiescence in his orders are where, after having been

[1] Od. xix. 157.

tempted by her fears or her interests to descend and take part in the transactions of the palace hall, she is desired by Telemachus to withdraw from society so little congenial to her own feelings. She obeys at once, and in silence. These scenes, in their occasional recurrence, are described in one of the usual graphic formulæ by which the poet loves to individualise events and characters: I. 356.

" ἀλλ' εἰς οἶκον ἰοῦσα τὰ σ' αὐτῆς ἔργα κόμιζε
ἱστόν τ' ἠλακάτην τε, καὶ ἀμφιπόλοισι κέλευε
ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι· μῦθος δ' ἄνδρεσσι μελήσει
πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί· τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἔστ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ."
ἡ μὲν θαμβήσασα πάλιν οἰκόνδε βεβήκει.

The same lines occur in the Odyssey XXI. 350., and in the Iliad VI. 490. at the close of the interview between Hector and Andromache; with the slight variation required by the circumstances of each case.

The pensive melancholy which forms the habitual tone of Penelope's mind, is similarly dramatised by an appropriate trait expressed in a single recurring form of words. When under the influence of any painful emotion, after some afflicting announcement, or fresh mortification at the hand of her persecutors, she is described as retiring to her chamber, throwing herself on her bed, and weeping over her absent lord and domestic woes until slumber relieves her sorrow. For example, after the scene in which she reproaches Antinoüs with his insidious designs against the life of her son, it is added: XVI. 449.

ἡ μὲν ἄρ' εἰσαναβᾶσ' ὑπερώϊα σιγαλόεντα . . . . .
κλαῖεν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα, φίλον πόσιν, ὄφρα οἱ ὕπνον
ἡδὺν ἐπὶ βλεφάροισι βάλε γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη.[1] . . . .

[1] Conf. I. 362., XIX. 602., XXI. 356.

15. The subordinate actors of the Odyssey are delineated with the same spirit and propriety as its leading characters. The cottage of the swineherd presents[1] a lively picture of the habits of rustic life, and the better sort of relation betwixt landlord and serf in the poet's age. Eumæus is one in whom gratitude to a beneficent master, if it have not obliterated the recollection of his own early days of freedom, has at least extinguished all desire for a change in his present condition. His patron, and his patron's family, are the objects around which his thoughts and affections are now concentrated, and the favourite theme of his rustic eloquence. His only griefs are the prolonged absence and supposed death of Ulysses, and the domestic distress of the royal house; his only cares to husband his master's store, cherish his memory, and long for his return. His hospitality to the afflicted wanderer is prompted even more by his desire to support the credit of his lord's establishment, than by his own benevolent disposition.

Eumæus the swineherd.

In the treacherous goatherd Melanthius, on the other hand, we have to the life the base-born, low-minded, rustic blackguard, whose brutal conduct and scurrilous tongue made him a fit partisan and associate of the faction whose cause he had espoused.[2] The affectionate, and at times officious zeal of the faithful old nurse Euryclea, or the housekeeper Eurynome, is equally well contrasted with the insolent levity of the wanton Melantho. Nor can there be a more spirited portrait than that presented in the beggar Irus, of the lazy idle vagabond, or of the bully and sycophant, blusterer and coward, united

Melanthius the goatherd.

Euryclea.

Melantho.

Irus the beggar.

[1] XIV. sqq. passim.

[2] XVII. 212. sqq.

in such a character. The poet's faculty of individualising his actors equally displays itself where there is the least apparent intention or opportunity, even where they extend beyond the pale of human nature. The mutineer Eurylochus, the poor sluggard Elpenor, the seer Theoclymenus, the enchantress Circe, the monster Polyphemus, Æolus, Proteus, and the Læstrygonian ogres, are all instinctively, as it were, assigned their place in the imagination, under some proper variety of person and conduct.

Eurylochus.

Among the internal evidences of unity of origin in the two poems, attention has already been drawn to the close similarity of the mode in which their author's faculty of conceiving and representing human nature, under every difference of scene and subject, is displayed in each. That similarity is, perhaps, most delicately exemplified in certain pairs of characters belonging one to each poem, between whose lot, or the parts they are made to perform, there happens to be some analogy. The parallel of Penelope and Andromache has already been considered. There is, also, little difficulty in recognising in the beggar Irus the hand which delineated Thersites, or in the placid gossip of Eumæus the dramatic skill which animates the more dignified loquacity of Nestor. Ulysses indeed, in his assumed character of veteran warrior, exhibits the peculiarities of the old Pylian hero, even to certain idiomatic turns of his oratory, with a fidelity which, free from all suspicion of imitation, seems to guarantee the two portraits as works of the same master.[1] A similar inference results from the consistency with which the

Nestor. Menelaus. Helen.

[1] xiv. 222. 468. 503.

characters of the Iliad are reproduced in the Odyssey. This point has already been illustrated in the case of Menelaus. The distinctive qualities assigned to that hero in the Iliad, whether in his personal capacity or his relation to his fellow-chiefs, reappear in the Odyssey in such precisely identical colours, as to leave no room for doubt that the author of each poem, whether the same or different, had, at least, the very same prototype present to his mind.[1] The remark applies with more or less force to Ulysses, Nestor, and Helen. The examples of Menelaus and Ulysses are important in a historical point of view, from the refutation they afford of a popular doctrine of the Separatist school, which would account for the harmony of characters, facts, and style in the two poems, by a corresponding unity in the genius at large of the primitive epic minstrelsy. Upon this principle, the same harmony would be observable in the works of other accredited organs of that genius. But the reverse is notoriously the case; both these heroes being invested by the remaining poets of the Epic cycle, or the Attic dramatists who borrow from them, with very different and very degrading attributes.[2]

Nestor, even during his short appearance on the scene, has time to display the same essential peculiarities which distinguish him in the camp before Troy; the same benevolence, cheerfulness of temper, and frankness of demeanour; the same affectionate familiarity with youth; the same love of conversation and good cheer; the same fluency of oratory, with the same tendency to wander from the immediate

[1] Supra, Ch. vii. § 8. [2] Infra, Ch. xv. § 8., xviii. § 16.

subject of discourse, on his own topics of egotistic enlargement.[1]

The Helen of the Odyssey, reconciled to her home and husband, is the same Helen whom we knew in the Iliad as the paramour of Paris, under such small degree of variety as was warranted by change of destiny and lapse of time. Although described as still beautiful, her person and manners are shaded by a veil of matronly gravity, to be expected after an interval of ten years, and under such altered circumstances. She is distinguished by the same elegance and courtesy, and the same voluptuous habits. She enters the hall of the Spartan palace[2] with a pomp of female luxury never assigned by Homer to any other heroine, preceded by three waiting-maids, one bearing her throne, another soft rugs or cushions, a third her richly stored silver work-basket. In the course of the dialogue, there appears the same mixture as formerly of self-reproach and easy indifference, in her allusions to her past conduct; while the longing after her first husband and native land, which in the Iliad also occasionally came over her mind, is here described by herself as having, towards the close of the war, so grown upon her, as to render her as false to the cause of the Trojans as she had formerly been to the bed of Menelaus.[3] A curious trait of primitive luxury, which the poet, with a fine adaptation to her character and habits, obviously therefore not without some moral signification, has attributed to her[4], is the use of a drug calculated to banish thought, and promote oblivion of past or indifference to present subjects of vexation. This

[1] III. 32. sqq. [2] IV. 121. sqq. [3] 260. [4] 220.

drug was a present from the queen of Egypt, whose court she had recently visited with her husband. The view of some commentators that it was opium, used in the East, as they suppose, from time immemorial as at this day for the same purpose, is certainly not devoid of probability.

CHAP. X.

HOMER. ILIAD AND ODYSSEY. DISCORDANCES OF THE TEXT.

1. INCONGRUITY OF HISTORICAL DETAILS A COMMON FEATURE OF PROLONGED EPIC NARRATIVES. — 2. EXAMPLE FROM THE ODYSSEY. — 3. ANOMALY A CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE OF GREAT ORIGINAL GENIUS. — 4. OTHER SOURCES OF ANOMALY IN POETICAL WORKS. — 5. JOURNEY OF TELEMACHUS. ANALOGY OF THE ATTIC DRAMA. — 6. EURYLOCHUS IN THE ISLE OF CIRCE. — 7. VARIATIONS IN THE PERSONAL NARRATIVE OF THE DISGUISED ULYSSES. — 8. HIS DIALOGUE WITH THE CYCLOPS. WITH EUMÆUS. TRANSACTIONS IN SCHERIA. — 9. RETURN OF TELEMACHUS FROM SPARTA. CHRONOLOGY OF THE ODYSSEY. — 10. ANOMALIES OF THE ILIAD. FORTIFICATION OF THE CAMP. SECESSION OF ACHILLES. — 11. DUEL OF HECTOR AND AJAX. THE GODS IN ETHIOPIA. THE SLEEP OF AGAMEMNON. ARMS OF PATROCLUS.

Incongruity of historical details a common feature of epic narratives.

1. THE analysis of the plan and structure of each poem, in so far as bearing on the question of their authorship, has hitherto been limited solely or chiefly to their internal evidence of unity and consistency. It remains to consider those incongruities to which so great importance has been attached as arguments on the opposite side. That many such discrepancies do exist, is undeniable; and the mere adduction of a certain amount of them has, in many quarters, been considered as an adequate triumph of the ingenuity of the critic over the unity of the poet. Nor have the adherents of the old opinion ventured by any bold line of criticism to impugn such inferences. They have usually been satisfied either with attempting by subtle explanations to strain palpable discordances into harmony, or with accounting for them by interpolation or corruption; expedients which tend, in fact, but to strengthen the case of

their opponents. The subject will here be taken up on broader principles, involving considerations of no small moment, as affecting not merely an insulated point of Homeric criticism, but the genius at large of epic poetry in every stage of its cultivation.

The first question which here presents itself, and one of momentous bearing on the whole inquiry, is: How stands the case with regard to other epic authors, and what would be the consequence of an equally rigorous enforcement in their case of the same tests applied to Homer? It would require no very rigid scrutiny of many an elaborate poem of modern times, which it were absurd to doubt is, in its integrity, the genuine work of the author whose name it bears, to satisfy any impartial reader that such anomalies are much more frequently the result of oversight, of the contempt of genius for petty details, or even of wilful intention on the part of a single poet, than of that discordance which marks the operations of many. The action of the Æneid, to select the example most apposite in the eyes of the classical student, presents incoherences and self-contradictions far surpassing, both in number and degree, the utmost that have ever been detected in either Iliad or Odyssey. The same holds good, to a greater or less extent, not only of Dante, Milton, and probably every other great poet, but of many a standard prose writer, sacred and profane.[1] Before therefore such anomalies can supply ground for any legitimate inference, it must be established upon some sound principle, what portion of them in any given case is to be ascribed to the one, and what to the other, of the two classes of causes above specified. As preliminary to any

[1] See Appendix F.

such inquiry, another no less important question offers itself: Whether the Iliad and Odyssey are to be judged in this particular by the same law as any similar work of historical times, or by certain by-laws applicable to them alone? To this question there can be but one answer in any reasonable quarter: that the same rule ought to be applied to all; or that, if any exception be made, the strongest claim to indulgence belongs to the poet of a period least provided with technical aids to accurate composition. If then it can be proved, by the same internal criteria as would be valid in regard to Virgil or Dante, that the anomalies of Homer are, in a large number of cases, such as cannot reasonably be explained otherwise than by the purely personal class of causes, we are in some measure precluded, by the fundamental law that every author is his own best interpreter, from judging other cases, where possibly the same criteria may not exist, by any more subtle rule.

Example from the Odyssey.

2. In order to have the general question more tangibly before us, it may be proper, by an illustrative example, to form some clear estimate of the mode or extent in which the peculiarity here under review is observable in the structure of either poem. The example about to be selected is one generally held to be the most intractable, even by the keenest defenders of Homer's unity. It occurs in the Odyssey, in the comparative chronology of two parallel courses of the action: the journey of Telemachus, and the voyage of Ulysses from Calypso's island. Telemachus starts on the evening of the second day after the poem opens, with the intention of being back in Ithaca on the twelfth at furthest.[1] He

[1] II. 374. sqq.; conf. IV. 632.

arrives on the morning of the third day at Pylos, and on the evening of the fifth at Sparta, where the poet leaves him on the morning of the sixth, to return to the affairs of Ithaca. In his conversation with Menelaus on that morning, the young hero is pressed to remain ten or twelve days at Sparta. This invitation he declines, adding that he would willingly spend a year there, but that his companions whom he had left at Pylos were already impatient for his return.[1] The next book takes up the history of Ulysses. Mercury is dispatched to Calypso's island, on the next day at soonest, it may be presumed, after that on which we parted from Telemachus; the seventh, consequently, from the opening of the poem. The raft of Ulysses is ready on the fourth[2] day afterwards (the 11th from the commencement). He sails seventeen days (28th); on the eighteenth (29th) his raft is destroyed.[3] After being tossed on the waves two whole days[4], he reaches the island of Scheria on the third (32nd). He remains there three days[5] (35th), and an the fourth is landed on his native island[6]; the 25th since parting from Calypso, and the 36th from the opening of the poem.

Now Telemachus does not reach Ithaca, on his return, until the day after his father, the thirty-seventh of the poem, and the thirty-sixth since his own departure from home. He had, therefore, been absent three times the period originally promised. We left him at Sparta on the sixth day, determined to return home forthwith; add three days for his journey and voyage, deduct the nine from the whole thirty-seven, and it results that he had remained

[1] iv. 595. sqq. [2] v. 262. [3] v. 279.
[4] v. 388. [5] vi. sqq. [6] xiii. 119.

twenty-eight days with Menelaus, more than double the twelve proposed by that hero and declined by himself. He had consequently kept his companions, formerly described as so anxious for his return, together with his borrowed ship, lying off the coast of Pylos a whole lunar month. Here then is a very palpable discordance, perhaps the most important in the text of either poem, and which has therefore been very plausibly adduced as an argument of original disconnexion between these two portions of the Odyssey.

The validity of any such inference must, however, depend on another consideration of no small importance as affecting this and other similar cases of anomaly: Whether they be less compatible with the genius of a single poet, ranging with the native freedom of a lively imagination over an extensive subject, than with the cautious artifice of the professional bookmakers whom the modern theory substitutes in his place? Considering the wonderful ingenuity displayed by these supposed amalgamators of discordant materials, the pains they must have been at to soften down so many discrepancies of fact or allusion, to connect by mutual references so many petty incidents, even where the absence of such mechanical links would never have been felt, is it likely, or even possible, that they would have overlooked an error of eight-and-twenty days in the chronology of a narrative the whole duration of which does not exceed forty? The functions of these supposed compilers were obviously, as regards mere mechanical combination, equivalent to those of original authors. Their productions were as much entitled to the credit of original design, as any modern Roman building constructed by Vignola or Fontana with columns and cornices

supplied by the ruins of antient edifices. It were quite as probable that one of those artists would have been contented, in the adjustment of his borrowed masonry, to place a Corinthian and Ionic capital side by side in the same series, as that such a blunder as that above noticed would have been left uncorrected by the masters of the Pisistratian school of patchwork epic architecture.

This consideration goes far to vitiate, in its source, the whole train of sceptical reasoning usually resorted to in such cases. The introduction, for example, of warriors severely wounded on one day, fresh and vigorous on the next, or even on the same, is a license, and no small one certainly, of familiar occurrence in the Iliad. A critical study of the text, however, evinces it to be one inherent in the spirit of the old epic muse, and as inseparable from the subordinate parts into which it is proposed to subdivide the poem as from its collective integrity. But even setting aside this fact, were such license more compatible with the cautious artifice of a bookmaker than with the genius of an original author, in a narrative working throughout on supernatural mechanism? Compilers of such tact and skill as those here in question would never surely have ventured, without some precedent in the usage of epic art, arbitrarily to introduce, in a poem which they were about to offer as the most finished specimen of that art, a novelty calculated to shock either the judgement or the taste of their public.

3. It is an old and sound remark[1], that faultless precision of detail is the attribute of mediocrity; anomaly the invariable characteristic of the higher

Anomaly the ordinary characteristic of great

[1] Longin. De Sublim. xxxiii.

original genius.

order of genius in every branch of imitative art. Among the modes in which that anomaly displays itself in poetry is a disregard of the strict rules of narrative probability, especially where likely to interfere with the general effect of a composition. Similar violations of rigid truth or nature are often observable in the works of the great antient sculptors and modern Italian painters, even in those where the general result is most to be admired. Here, a shadow is made to fall on objects which, on strictly optical principles, it would not have reached; there, a figure filling up a space in the grouping of the background is larger or smaller, more or less distinct, than the strict rules of perspective enjoin.[1] Such license, in the abstract, cannot, it is true, be defended. It may, therefore, in so far, be subject of regret that Homer or Raphael should yield to artists of an inferior order in the mechanical adjustment of their works. It must however also be remembered, that had they been equally scrupulous, they would not have been Homer or Raphael, nor should we have had either an Iliad or a Transfiguration. Our limited knowledge of the higher economy of creation enables us to perceive the fact, though not to assign the cause, why so much in the visible works of nature which appears to us

[1] Hence may in part be explained that carelessness of perspective and poverty of landscape accompaniment, which seem to have characterised many even of the higher productions of Greek painting and sculpture. These blemishes can hardly be attributed to incapacity, in an age which produced an Archimedes, and in the face of so deep a knowledge of drawing and anatomy as is displayed in the same works. The scope of Greek design was to represent human life and character in the most beautiful or striking forms, or the most harmonious groups. Geometrical precision in the adjustment of lines of building or scenery was a secondary consideration. So in fact Plato, Critias, p. 107. n. sq.

defective may yet be so connected with acknowledged advantages as to be indispensable to their existence. We often see a countenance in the individual features of which no actual blemish can be detected, but where we are as little struck by any beauty; on the other hand one is apt, on beholding a handsome face combining certain irregularities of feature, to imagine that by slightly varying its lineaments, by adding length or fulness in one part, or subtracting it in another, perfection would be the result. But, could the alterations be effected, they would probably but tend to prove how inferior the work of "nature's journeyman" was to her own; and, undoubtedly, the same secret blending of imperfection and excellence in the parts is as essential to aggregate beauty in the works of human genius as in those of nature.

This principle has been distinctly seen and laid down by both Aristotle[1] and Longinus.[2] Among the various classes of anomaly which it involves, that here in question has been comprehended by the former critic under what he defines, in scarce translatable phraseology, as the "Imitation of the Impossible." In the abstract he observes it cannot be defended, but is to be excused or even admired, where tending to enhance the general effect of a work. For illustration of the rule he appeals, as usual, to Homer; and one of the examples cited will be noticed in the sequel. In fact, one of the most remarkable of the poet's talents is this very one of making even discordances

[1] Poetic. c. xxv. xxvi. ed. Bip.; conf. Plat. Critias, p. 107. c.

[2] De Sublim. sect. xxxiii. A remarkable passage, where this great critic characterises the petty anomalies of Homer, so captiously founded on by his hypercritical successors of the present day, with singular point, as, *παραρρήματα, δι' ἀμέλειαν εἰκῇ που, καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν, ὑπὸ μεγαλοφυΐας ἀνεπισταύτως ἀνηνεγμένα.*

of detail contribute to general harmony of effect. Hence it is that such blemishes, palpable as they often are, have rarely been observed, still less condemned by those who judge the Iliad and Odyssey in the true spirit of their author. Nor, in the whole range of subtleties in which successive schools of Homeric criticism have indulged, is there one more fallacious or pernicious than the practice, lately so much in vogue, of picking petty flaws and holes in the mechanical structure of the poems, while all their grander features of moral and poetical harmony are overlooked. Against such an ordeal, no epic composition, even if indited by the pen of Calliope herself, could stand for a moment.

Other sources of anomaly in poetical works.

4. Admitting however, that such anomalies may proceed as well from the inadvertence, or even artifice, of a single poet, as from patchwork or interpolation, the question naturally arises: What are the criteria for ascribing those discernible in Homer's text to the one rather than the other class of causes? They are to be sought partly in the internal structure of the text itself, partly in the tenor of those same commentaries where the above distinction has been confounded. The discordances in question occur, in more or less palpable form, not only in the integral, and as regards subject or space least connected heads of narrative, but also in contiguous passages; and are often so closely interwoven with the minutest fibres of the text, as to be essential to the very pith and substance, not merely of its historical import, but of its syntactical structure. The cases, however, to which importance has been attached by the advocates of primitive non-integrity, are confined solely or chiefly to the former class, while the latter are either

overlooked, or noticed as mere eccentricities of the poet or poets from whom the separate rhapsodies are supposed to emanate. But it is not easy to see upon what principle this method can be justified; or how so fatal an importance can be ascribed to discordances occurring at wide intervals, and where oversight were both natural and excusable, while the same irregularities, in a more glaring position of contiguity, pass unheeded. The only apparent ground of the distinction is, that the one class of examples supplied the sceptical doctrine with arguments possessing an outward show of plausibility, while a similar inference extended to the other would equally annihilate the textual integrity of the supposed separate elements, cutting them up into such shreds and patches as would have been found impracticable materials for the ingenuity even of the artificial compiler. Here there is an inconsistency on the part of the commentators quite equal to any imputed to the text, and which can only be avoided by the more logical conclusion, that the same peculiarities occurring throughout the same work, in the same forms, originate in the same cause, anomaly of genius in the same author.

The cases now about to be quoted may be classed under two heads. The one comprises incongruities to all appearance intentional, where Homer's object seems to have been, with a disregard or even a wilful violation of rigid consistency, to produce a certain poetical effect, or obtain a wider field for the exercise of his inventive powers; the remainder are such as seem to be altogether involuntary, resulting from the natural contempt of genius for minor details. The usual custom would here enjoin that precedence

should be given to the text of the Iliad; but the example already selected as the basis of illustration having been derived from the Odyssey, it will be preferable to carry on the analysis in the first instance through the remainder of the same work.

Voyage of Telemachus.

5. Among the integral subdivisions of the poem set apart in the popular theories on the subject as originally independent compositions, one of the most important is the description of the voyage of Telemachus to Peloponnesus, comprising the four opening books down to verse 624. of Delta. The young hero announces his intention in a public assembly of the citizens, and asks a vessel from the suitors, which is insolently refused. He afterwards borrows one from his friend Noëmon, and mans it with a select body of Ithacan youths. He then takes a formal leave of the suitors, informing them at the same time of his having elsewhere procured the means of transport to Pylos, and that the object of his voyage was to concert means for their destruction. In their reply they again turn his project into ridicule.[1] He next communicates his intentions to the old housekeeper of the palace, Eurycleа[2], binding her by an oath to keep his absence secret from his mother until his return, or until a lapse of ten or twelve days from the date of his departure.[3] Now let us consider what a tissue of anomalies is here. What can be more inconsistent than the conduct of Telemachus, in formally apprising the suitors, who had just before discountenanced his voyage, of the arrangements he had made to carry it into effect in spite of them, telling them also plainly that their own lives were at stake in the matter? It was little else than an invitation

[1] II. 212. sqq., 386. sqq., 316., III. 363. [2] II. 349. [3] 373.

to them to arrest his person. In the next place, is it credible that a project proclaimed aloud by himself in the national assembly and the palace hall, a project already, like all other topics, matter of scurrilous jest with the suitors, should have remained a mystery to the housekeeper of the palace until announced to her, under a vow of secrecy too, by her young master? What more unaccountable than that Telemachus, after the pains he had taken to make the thing notorious to the whole town, after having, without any vow of secrecy, manned his vessel with twenty young citizens, whose friends must all have been privy to the affair, should yet have been such a simpleton as to believe, that the swearing in of a single old woman to silence would keep his departure secret from an anxious mother during a fortnight's absence, and amid the incessant gossiping of which she and her concerns were the principal butt on the part of the suitors and their adherents? Upon Wolfian principles, it is plain, that neither the passages in which Telemachus bids adieu to the suitors, nor that where he swears in Euryclea, could be by the author of the council-scene or of the previous account of the prince's conduct. The text however is here intractable, and the anomaly has been overlooked. In the sequel the case becomes worse. During several days, not only Penelope but the suitors are represented altogether ignorant of the expedition, until Noëmon, standing in need of his vessel, applies to them for information as to the probable time of the prince's return, in the very natural confidence that they must be cognizant of his motions. But they are as much amazed as if they had never heard a syllable

of the matter, and inquire with much anxiety into the circumstances of his departure, "having been all along under the impression that he was gone into the country to look after his farm!"[1] All this incongruity appears the more glaring, when it is considered how easily it might have been avoided. The young hero might have been made, preserving silence in public, first to sound the suitors as to their acquiescence in his voyage. On discovering their repugnance to it, he might have said no more on the subject for the present, but, affecting to abandon his scheme and to be really going into the country for a week, might have secretly borrowed his vessel and taken his other measures without risk of detection. In this way, both his exaction of the vow from Eurycleа, and the subsequent ignorance of his mother and the suitors, would have been quite natural.

The question then occurs, How can Homer, either as author of the whole Odyssey or of this particular rhapsody, be justified in such a disregard of probability? The answer is, first, that no unprejudiced reader probably has ever been offended by his mode of management; and secondly, that the more precise method above suggested might have been less conducive to the general effect of the poem. The prince's announcement of his project in the public assembly, with his request of a ship so contemptuously treated by the suitors, gives a spirited turn to the debate. Their subsequent indifference to so really important a matter, of which they had been so formally warned, supplies some graphic touches both to their own character and that of Telemachus, who, hitherto a quiet passive youth, had appeared to them incapable

[1] IV. 630. 638.

of venturing on any bold step for the assertion of his rights. Hence the contempt with which they treat his proposed voyage as but an innocent bravado, and their amazement on discovering its actual execution, are valuable ingredients of the ethic spirit of the Odyssey. That the publicity given to the expedition was incompatible with ignorance on the part of the servants and other secondary personages, cannot here enter into consideration. It is a fundamental principle of Greek poetry, epic as well as dramatic, and one largely exemplified in both Iliad and Odyssey, that none but the leading personages shall be entitled to know more or less of what is going on than suits the poet's convenience. Hence, on the Attic stage, by an exaggeration of this principle, all the secrets of the plot are intrusted to the chorus, which is often a body of females of the middle class, representing consequently the most loquacious and least trustworthy portion of the community; and on the modern theatre, under the rubric "aside," remarks are made within a few yards of the person from whom they are supposed to be kept secret, in a voice which would suit the commander of a battalion. To these partial inconsistencies the Greek audience, in its day, submitted, as does our own at the present, in consideration of advantages only to be obtained at their expense. By a parallel species of license, it is here assumed that the Ithacan public, in the vulgar sense, are not privileged to interfere. The poet has thus obtained a further opening for several interesting scenes: first, between Telemachus and his faithful old nurse, and afterwards between her and Penelope, when the truth is at last revealed to the queen. This crisis is brought about through the medium of

Analogy of the Attic drama.

Noëmon, the lender of the vessel, and in so far a principal in the transaction, but who, a discreet and reserved person as his name denotes, had hitherto remained in the background, until under the pressure of his own affairs he applies to the suitors for intelligence; and thus, by the proper epic agency, the case becomes too notorious for either them or the queen to remain any longer in the dark.

Eurylochus in the isle of Circe.

6. This privilege of the epic art applies, not merely to ignorance but to knowledge, which will also be found, in numerous cases, to exist or be wanting at the discretion of the poet. For example, on landing on the island of Circe, Ulysses sends a party, headed by his lieutenant Eurylochus, to explore the country.[1] On their approaching the dwelling of the sorceress, she appears at the door and invites them to partake of her hospitality. All enter, with the exception of the leader, who suspected treachery. The party within are converted by their landlady into hogs. Eurylochus remains awhile expecting their reappearance, but in vain. He then returns, greatly alarmed, and reports them missing to his chief. Ulysses determines himself to go in quest of them, and orders Eurylochus to act as his guide, who, not yet recovered from his fright, refuses. The hero proceeds alone, defeats the arts of the sorceress, and returns to the vessel to bring up the rest of the crew to her palace. On his arrival the men surround him, eager to learn the fate of their comrades. He bids them, drily, put their equipage in order, and come themselves to see and partake of the good cheer that awaits them. Upon this Eurylochus interposes, and strongly dissuades them from obedience, assuring them

[1] x. 208. sqq.

that "the sorceress will convert them also into hogs or wild beasts."[1] Here then Eurylochus is suddenly inspired with a knowledge of the previous fate of his own detachment, which no part of the text admits of his having obtained by natural means. He had not seen what happened. The terror he displayed on returning to the ship was but the foreboding of some mysterious evil; nor, had he been privy to the real cause of his men's detention, could he have limited his report to a simple statement of their not being forthcoming. His knowledge therefore is evidently but an afterthought of Homer, introductory to the scene that followed, and supplying a few additional touches to the character of the mutinous lieutenant, a personage of some importance among the second-rate heroes of the Odyssey.

Personal narrative of the disguised Ulysses.

7. Another case which, from the more favourable arrangement of the text, has afforded a readier handle to casuistry, occurs in the variations made by the disguised Ulysses in the personal narratives with which he successively entertains Eumæus, the suitors, and Penelope. These passages are richly illustrative, not only of the conventional knowledge or ignorance authorised by epic usage, but of the hero's ready talent for dissimulation, and the spirit of comic humour which runs through the action of the poem. In every emergency he has at once a new and plausible version of his life and adventures at command, adapted to the circumstances of the case or the dress he has assumed. When accosted by Minerva, in her disguise of a shepherd boy, on first awakening from the sleep in which he had been deposited on his native coast, ignorant where he is, he inquires the name of

[1] x. 433.

the country. When told that he is in Ithaca, he is almost overpowered with joy, but suppressing all outward demonstration gravely replies, "that he had heard indeed of such an island in his own native land of Crete, but had never expected to visit it." He then enters on a fictitious account of his life, and the manner of his transport to this strange country.[1] His patroness hears him patiently to the end, and then, discovering herself, banters him on his unrivalled talent for the arts of intrigue.

On reaching the hut of Eumæus in his new character of mendicant, a longer and more varied series of fictions is required to amuse his host.[2] Little of his previous matter of fact is retained but his Cretan origin and certain exploits in the Trojan war. The additions comprise a predatory voyage to Egypt, and sundry adventures in Lybia, Phœnicia, and Epirus.

In the suitor's hall this account is again partly repeated, partly varied.[3] His captivity in Egypt still forms the basis of the narrative, but the details are different.

Penelope, on the other hand, in their midnight interview[4], is favoured with another version of the Cretan story formerly told to Minerva. On this occasion, no longer content with the humble capacity in which he had previously figured as natural son of a Cretan nobleman, he has the boldness to announce himself a brother of king Idomeneus.

This spirited series of fictions, so characteristic of the genius of the poem, so replete with the liveliest features of Homeric style, has yet been stigmatised by modern hypercriticism as interpolation or patchwork, and on the very ground which constitutes a chief

[1] XIII. 256. [2] XIV. 199. [3] XVII. 419. [4] XIX. 172.

part of its value: that the different accounts contradict each other! that it is "improbable," forsooth, "the beggar should address conflicting stories to the different members of the household, because, by communicating among themselves, they might have detected his self-contradictions."[1] Had Homer been obtuse enough, from any such considerations, to obtrude again and again the same hackneyed tale upon his audience, he would be as little entitled to the praise bestowed by Aristotle on his own inventive genius, as his hero would deserve the like compliment paid him by his patroness Minerva.

In the Phæacian palace this talent for innocent fibbing is still more broadly exemplified. When Alcinoüs reproves his daughter for want of hospitality, in not at once conducting the stranger from his landing-place to the palace, Ulysses vindicates her by an assurance that she had pressed him to accompany her, but that he, from modesty, had loitered behind.[2] The fact as previously narrated is the very reverse. The hero, noway disinclined to her escort, had postponed his entry into the city by her express order.[3] His reply, evidently, is just what occurred to him at the moment to get his fair benefactress out of a scrape.

That this spirit of ready pretext was common to the Laërtian royal family, appears from another similar expedient on the part of Telemachus. While still an inmate in the palace of Menelaus, he is warned by Minerva in a dream to return home forthwith, for that his mother had consented to espouse Eurymachus[4], and that his presence is urgently required

[1] B. Thiersch, Urgestalt d. Odyss. p. 74.
[2] VII. 298. sqq.
[3] VI. 295.
[4] XV. 17.

to look after his own interests. The next morning, when Menelaus inquires the cause of such haste, Telemachus answers simply, that he has become anxious about the management of his property at home during his long absence.[1] Any mention of his vision or his mother's marriage, by exciting curiosity, might have involved delay; he therefore seizes the first pretext that offers, as a means of effecting his escape. Nor, on his arrival in Ithaca, does he express the least surprise at finding matters exactly in the same position as when he left home.

8. The preceding examples have been limited chiefly to cases where the anomaly appears more or less intentional on the poet's part. In the following it may be attributed solely to oversight or inadvertence.

His dialogue with the Cyclops;

Ulysses, on escaping from Polyphemus, pushes off his vessel "as far from the shore as a man's voice could be heard,"[2] and then triumphantly taunts his baffled enemy. The giant, in return, hurls a fragment of rock in the direction of the ship, which narrowly escapes destruction. The hero, nothing daunted, rows out to a distance "double that at which he uttered his first address," and again gives vent to his reproaches, to which Polyphemus again replies. The question, then, is: How could this second harangue reach the ears of the giant, if uttered at twice as great a distance as a man's voice could be heard?

with Eumæus.

When Ulysses, in the hut of Eumæus, complains of cold, and asks for the loan of a blanket, the swineherd is made to remark in reply, that "in his establishment each man had but a single blanket for his own use." Six lines afterwards he is described as

[1] xv. 88. [2] ix. 473. 491.

lending his guest "one both large and warm, which he always kept by him for a change, or for extra covering in very cold weather." [1]

Transactions in Scheria.

The account of the hero's arrival and reception in Scheria offers a most curious succession of glaring discordances, which yet, owing to the impracticability of the context, has never given serious umbrage in sceptical quarters. In the first place, the poet and his hero between them are guilty of making the sun set at least twice in one day. Ulysses in his narrative to Arete says, that on awakening from his slumber in the bush, "after the sun had gone down," [2] he descried Nausicaa with her maidens playing on the beach. The poet, however, in his own previous account of the same events [3], informs us that the sun set on that evening just before the party reached the grove of Minerva, several hours after it had disappeared according to his hero, allowing a reasonable time for the journey and other intermediate transactions. Aristarchus proposed to smooth down this difficulty [4], very arbitrarily as well as unnecessarily, by altering the text. But even this remedy would be inadequate to the disease, for the sequel gives a virtual contradiction to both passages. Although Ulysses does not proceed from the grove to the city until after another considerable interval, consequently until after complete darkness must have spread over the land, yet the whole account of his entry implies it to have taken place in broad daylight. Not only was Pallas obliged to cover her favourite with a cloud, to preserve him from the impertinence of the populace, but

[1] XIV. 513. 521. [2] VII. 289. [3] VI. 321.

[4] By changing δύσετο (VII. 289.) into δείλετο, a term foreign to the vocabulary both of Homer and of Hellas. Schol. Palat. ad loc.

he was himself able to take a minute survey of the objects of curiosity on his walk; of the port and arsenal; of the external ornaments of the palace; the fruit trees, flower-beds, and fountains of the royal gardens. The mode in which this tissue of petty incongruities is interwoven with the nicest fibres of the text is not only such as to exclude the possibility of a solution, but amounts to a literary curiosity; for the same sentence which describes the hero as gazing with admiration on the brilliant objects that adorned the exterior of the royal residence, introduces him into the banqueting-hall, where he finds Alcinoüs and his guests engaged in the usual solemnities before retiring to bed.[1]

Return of Telemachus from Sparta.

9. Let us now return for a moment to the more serious chronological discrepancy from which we originally set out, and inquire how far it may be explained by the same twofold peculiarity of the poet's genius, a disregard of minute details, and a readiness to sacrifice them to poetical effect. Homer had undertaken to interweave the adventures of Telemachus with those of Ulysses, in the relation to each other of principal subject and episode. Telemachus is first sent to Pylos and Sparta. The circumstances under which his voyage takes place, with the state in which he left his mother and household, require that his excursion should be speedily performed, or at least that he should set out with the intention of using expedition. This intention is adhered to up to the moment when we leave him to attend to the affairs of his father. Here a different mode of management was required. Whether in deference to the popular legend, or from the poet's desire to mag-

[1] VII. 138.

nify the adventures of Ulysses, nearly a lunar month is devoted to the voyage of that hero from Calypso's isle to Ithaca. In resuming the history of Telemachus therefore, either a tacit anomaly was unavoidable, or his previous arrangement must have been varied, in order to bring his course into chronological harmony with that of his father. This alternative, it seems, whether from oversight or indifference, did not occur to the poet; and he has allowed the case to remain as it stood, leaving us to explain it as we best can. It may be observed however, that although there is discordance there is here no actual self-contradiction. The inconsistency results merely from the reliance which the reader is led to place, naturally enough no doubt, on the previously expressed intention of Telemachus to return speedily. We are at least at liberty to imagine that Menelaus had found means in the interval to persuade him to remain three weeks instead of three days. The narrative of the visit, as resumed in the fifteenth book, implies indeed this alteration of plan. Neither the remonstrance of Pallas at his long delay, nor her account (which, though false, seemed true to the prince,) of the momentous change in his domestic affairs, appear compatible with an adherence to his original intention of remaining but a week or ten days from home.

Chronology of the Odyssey.

It may be remarked, in further illustration of the chronological discrepancy in the voyage of Telemachus, that the computation of time throughout the Odyssey, with its greater variety of events and localities, has no pretensions to that regular and progressive accuracy observable in the Iliad.[1] Discordances of a similar, though less glaring, nature exist in other cases,

[1] See Appendix G.

where the structure of the text still more effectually excludes any sceptical inference. For example, on the night of the disguised hero's arrival in the hut of Eumæus, its inmates are sent to bed with the usual formalities.[1] That same night Telemachus, still at Sparta, is warned by Minerva in a vision to return home.[2] He sets out at daybreak, and, after a journey by land and sea of two days and nights, reaches the coast of Ithaca on the third morning. During his voyage we leave him[3], and rejoin the party in the hut, who are found at dinner on the day after that on which they had been sent to bed. They again retire[4] to rest, and we return to Telemachus, who lands, and leaving his vessel on the shore walks up and joins his father at breakfast in the hut[5], on the third day after the arrival of Ulysses in the island, according to the chronology of his own adventures, but on the fourth according to that of his son's. The reckoning stands as follows:—

Ulysses.		Telemachus.
First night in the hut	=	First night at Sparta.
Second night in the hut	=	Second night at Pheræ. / Third night at sea.
Third night in the hut	=	Fourth night in the hut.[6]

[1] xiv. 523. [2] xv. 1. sqq. [3] xv. 301.
[4] xv. 494. [5] xv. 495., xvi. 1. sqq.

[6] The accuracy of this table, in the case of Telemachus, is clearly borne out by the description of his course. In that of Ulysses, where the chronology of the narrative itself is not so distinct, the computation is confirmed by xvii. 515.

Nitzsch (Erkläv. Anmkk. Bd. ii. S. liii.) would evade this incongruity, by assuming that Pallas appeared in vision to Telemachus at a later hour of the same morning on which her interview with Ulysses took place in the cave of the nymphs. This were out of Scylla into Charybdis; and as the poet has already been convicted of making the sun set twice in the same evening, he would here make it rise twice in the same morning.

Throughout the poem, it is said that Ulysses returned home on the tenth year after the fall of Troy, the twentieth after his own departure from Ithaca. But the chronology of his vicissitudes since the siege does not bear out that statement. He describes himself as having been detained seven years in the isle of Calypso[1] and one in that of Circe.[2] Add about seven months, as the sum of the lesser portions of time to be collected from the ninth to the twelfth books inclusive, the result does not exceed eight years and seven months. Let us now turn to the Iliad.

Anomalies of the Iliad.

10. Several cases of incongruity have already been incidentally cited[3] from the opening scenes of that poem, consisting in a certain accumulation of preliminary details at the expense of strict historical order, with the apparent object of laying a broader foundation for the ensuing narrative. These cases may be numbered to the class above described as originating in design rather than oversight. Such is the advice given by Nestor to Agamemnon in council as to the mode of marshalling his army; advice which, however appropriate it might have been in the first year of the war, was, historically speaking, quite out of place in the tenth. Such is the like injunction of Iris, disguised as Polites, to Priam, with her report relative to the advance and appearance of the Greek host. Another somewhat similar example is here subjoined.

Fortification of the camp.

During the nine years of the war previous to the quarrel of the chiefs, the Greek fleet and camp are

Minerva is plainly described as parting from Ulysses in broad daylight (XIII. 189. 344. sqq.): while it is distinctly stated (XV. 8. 49. sq.) that her subsequent appearance to his son was during the nighttime.

[1] VII. 259. [2] X. 469. [3] Ch. V. § 4. sq.

represented as having remained unprotected by any species of entrenchment, on an open coast, in the midst of a hostile country, under the poetical pretext that the terror of Achilles was a safeguard against hostile aggression.[1] The historical insufficiency of this pretext is obvious. Had every one of the 100,000 men who composed the host been an Achilles, their united valour would have been unavailing against the enterprise of a few daring peasants, armed with a tinder-box and favoured by a dark night and a scirocco wind. But setting this aside, it is further said that Achilles was occasionally absent for weeks[2] together, by sea and land, ravaging the country or besieging the towns of Priam's Asiatic allies. Why then, it may be asked, did the Trojans neglect these opportunities of attacking the enemy in his quarters, and setting fire to his tents and ships? The construction of the rampart belongs, therefore, historically, to the first year of the war.[3] Yet the details of every portion of the poem so incontestably prove its poetical connexion with the tenth, as completely to exclude every species of sceptical inference. That a camp protected by Achilles should require no artificial defence was essential to the heroic grandeur of his character. The construction of the rampart, on the other hand, after his secession, was both an additional homage to his glory, and necessary to the future conduct of the poem; to relieve the monotony of a series of field

[1] Il. ix. 352., iv. 512., et locc. citt. in Ch. v. § 1.

[2] ix. 325. sqq.

[3] Thucydides, accordingly, in his pragmatical notice of the Trojan war, dismissing the authority of Homer, describes the Greeks as fortifying their camp immediately after their establishment on the coast (i. xi.).

engagements, and impart variety to the martial vicissitudes of the action.

Secession of Achilles.

The knowledge which the Trojans are from the first assumed to possess of the quarrel of the chiefs, the secession of Achilles, and other transactions in the Greek camp, is altogether conventional. The text contains not a hint at the time or mode in which they obtained the information, or at the consequent change of tactics on their own side. In these details, the more methodical spirit of the modern Muse would have found abundant materials for episode. We should have had Trojan spies or treacherous Greeks sending notice to the city, a council held to deliberate on the important news, and a determination adopted to abandon the previous timid line of defence and face the enemy in the field. Homer probably saw no great poetical capabilities in such details. He therefore tacitly requests his readers to take them for granted, and introduces the Trojans at once familiar with all that had taken place, boldly marching out on the plain instead of skulking behind their city walls. Even Priam, in his dialogue with Helen, while obviously aware that the principal Greek hero was not present, neither makes any remark on his absence, nor betrays the least curiosity as to its cause.[1]

[1] This simple fact, the absence of the principal hero from the field during three great battles and sixteen whole books of the poem, while all the other chiefs are exhibited in a state of constant activity, ought, with reasonable critics, to go far in itself to vitiate the attacks on the original integrity of the series of martial cantos. The hypothesis of a careful cutting out of all the passages bearing on the hero's presence, and the insertion here and there of the numerous allusions to his absence, a hypothesis which W. Müller plainly inculcates, and which the arguments of his fellow-commentators necessarily involve, seems an astonishing climax of sceptical credulity.

Duel of Hector and Ajax.

11. In the seventh book, Apollo and Minerva consult as to the propriety of concluding the day's battle by a single combat between Hector and Ajax, and agree that Hector shall be the challenger. Helenus, the Trojan soothsayer, is then brought forward as the inspired medium of communication with Hector, whom he encourages to the adventure by an assurance of having overheard the two deities stipulate for his coming forth unscathed from the engagement.[1] Not a syllable however occurs of any such condition in their actual conversation. The intelligent critic will not fail to perceive the close congeniality of spirit between these cases and the previous examples of conventional knowledge or ignorance cited from the Odyssey. Nor can anything be more incongruous than that the Greeks, after the treacherous conduct of the Trojans on that very morning, should here complacently accept their renewed proposals of truce, and again place confidence in their oaths without the least notice of their late perjury. Yet every rational inference of a sceptical nature is excluded, by the distinct allusion of both Hector and Antenor[2] to that perjury; allusions so inseparably linked with the whole spirit of the context that no casuistry can get rid of them. The previous case of single combat, like the dream of Telemachus in the Odyssey, having served its purpose, is dismissed, and in no way allowed to interfere with the subsequent conduct of the action.

The gods in Ethiopia.

When Achilles requests his mother to interest Jupiter in his behalf, she replies, that he must wait until the return of the god from Ethiopia, whither he had gone the day before "with the rest of the

[1] VII. 53. [2] VII. 69. 351.

deities."[1] Yet we had just before been told, that on the morning of the day on which this dialogue took place, Pallas had been sent by Juno to check the fury of Achilles, and that, after having executed her commission she rejoined "the rest of the deities" in Olympus.[2] Apollo was also on that same morning still in the camp, shooting his arrows at the Greeks. Here is a naked self-contradiction which has yet, owing to the indissoluble connexion of the text, been passed over as a mere inadvertence by the keenest modern impugners of Homer's unity, and the antient commentators who notice it have been censured in the same quarters as hypercritical cavillers.[3]

Agamemnon's sleep.

On the night after the first great defeat of the Greeks, it is said, that "all the other chiefs[4]" slept soundly, with the exception of Agamemnon, kept awake by anxiety of mind. Yet shortly after, we are told that "Menelaus had passed an equally sleepless night" from a similar cause. In the sequel of the first quoted text, Agamemnon's restless anxiety is described as amounting to despair, when he "looked across the plain and beheld the Trojan watchfires." Yet a few lines afterwards it appears he was still in bed in his tent; for it is added that, after musing awhile what was to be done, he arose, dressed himself, and proceeded to the quarters of Nestor. This incoherence has been noticed by Aristotle in a

[1] I. 423. [2] I. 221.

[3] See Heyn. ad Il. I. 424. Since the above was written, the author has observed that Lachmann, undismayed even by Heyne's sneer at such "grammatical subtlety," has gallantly come forward to relieve the school of criticism to which he belongs from the discredit of having overlooked so important a link in the chain of evidence in favour of its doctrines. Betrachtt. üb. Homer's Il. p. 6.

[4] X. init.

passage of the Poetica, which is the more interesting from the circumstance that its author, who, like Homer, though seldom wrong in essentials is sometimes careless of details, has himself run into a very natural oversight, by quoting, as the basis of his criticism, instead of v. 1. of the tenth, the parallel exordium of the second book of the poem.[1]

The arms of Patroclus.

If the arms of Achilles fitted Patroclus, why does the former hero lament his inability to revenge his friend's death for want of arms[2], since the arms of Patroclus, which were lying in his tent, would equally have fitted himself? This inconsistency, though as palpable as many others to which sceptical importance has been attached, happens to be inseparably linked with the historical essence of the action; and,

[1] De Poet. xxvi. τὸ δὲ κατὰ μεταφορὰν εἴρηται, οἷον·

ἄλλοι μέν ῥα θεοί τε καὶ ἀνέρες . . . .
εὗδον παννύχιοι.

ἅμα δέ φησιν·

ἦτοι ὅτ' ἐς πεδίον τὸ Τρωικὸν ἀθρήσειεν,
αὐλῶν συρίγγων θ' ὕμαδον·

τὸ γὰρ πάντες ἀντὶ τοῦ πολλοὶ κατὰ μεταφορὰν εἴρηται.

The ἄλογον here imputed is twofold: first, the impossibility of Agamemnon looking across the plain while lying in bed in his tent; where it really exists: secondly, the impossibility of the Trojans making merry around their bonfires, if the whole human race except Agamemnon were asleep; the apology for which is, that the whole signifies metaphorically the greater part. In this latter case, however, the ἄλογον is chargeable on the philosopher himself, not the poet.

Such oversights are not uncommon with Aristotle in parallel cases. Yet this text, the spirit of which ought to be apparent to whoever competently apprehends the genius of either author, has so bewildered the commentators, that a recent respectable editor of the Poetica has even resorted in despair to the unjustifiable expedient of entirely omitting the words from ἅμα to ὕμαδον, in which lie the whole real pith and marrow of the passage. Graefenhahn ad loc. and in nott. p. 206.

[2] xviii. 192.

accordingly, the subtle attempts of the scholiasts to explain it away have been ridiculed by the same modern critics who are themselves in the habit of adducing far more trivial incongruities in support of their views, where the arrangement of the context happens to be more favourable.[1]

It were tedious to enumerate the additional examples of Homeric self-contradiction derivable from the text of the Iliad. Enough has been said to bear out the original position, that as such anomalies can be proved by internal evidence, at least in a large proportion of cases, to originate in a corresponding anomaly of the genius of a single poet, the fundamental rule of all sound criticism, that every author is his own best interpreter, precludes any arbitrary attempt to explain other cases, where the same criteria may not be so distinctly applicable, upon any more subtle or far-fetched principle.

[1] Heyn. ad loc.

CHAP. XI.

HOMER. ILIAD AND ODYSSEY. DIVINE MECHANISM.

1. DOCTRINE OF DIVINE INTERPOSITION IN HUMAN AFFAIRS, AS EMBODIED BY HOMER. — 2. HUMAN PERSONIFICATION OF THE DIVINE AGENCY. — 3. SCHEME OF DIVINE MANAGEMENT IN THE POEMS. — 4. CHARACTERS OF THE DEITIES. — 5. AGENCY OF APOLLO. NEPTUNE. THE RIVER GODS. VULCAN. MINERVA. DIVINE INSTIGATION TO CRIME. — 6. POETICAL DEFECTS OF HOMER'S DIVINE MECHANISM. — 7. THE GODS IN THEIR RELATION TO EACH OTHER. DOMESTIC BRAWLS IN OLYMPUS. — 8. DIVINATION. DREAMS. OMENS. — 9. OF HOMER'S OWN BELIEF IN THEIR EFFICACY. HIS DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE STATE. — 10. HIS DIVINE MECHANISM COMPARED WITH THAT OF MODERN POETRY. — 11. HIS DOCTRINE OF HUMAN APOTHEOSIS. — 12. OF ALLEGORY IN HIS DIVINE MECHANISM.

Doctrine of divine interposition in human affairs, as embodied by Homer.

1. THE religious mechanism of the Iliad and Odyssey cannot, for reasons stated in another place, be properly classed under any single one of the three more general heads, of action, characters, or style, into which the analysis of an epic poem resolves itself. It has therefore been reserved for separate treatment in the present chapter, with joint reference to the two poems, the questions it involves extending equally to both.

A belief in the direct agency of the Deity in the conduct of human affairs is a principle of natural religion common to every people and state of society. The devout Christian and the enlightened heathen each delight to trace the hand of a supreme being in the works of nature or the course of worldly destiny, and to acknowledge his retributive justice in the punishment of vice or the reward of virtue. Such sentiments, in all ages, are viewed with respect, even by those least susceptible of their influence. Yet, if

the source in which they originate be more narrowly investigated, it would appear as if their value depended rather on the objects on which they are brought to bear, than on their own intrinsic reason or propriety; for the man who carries the same train of reflexion into the ordinary concerns of life, who discovers in every petty disappointment a sign of divine displeasure, in every trifling piece of good fortune a token of favour, is an object of derision rather than respect. It is, however certain, that the agency of the Deity, if exercised at all, is exercised as actively in the one as in the other class of cases. He would at least be a bold casuist who should pretend to mark out the relative amount of importance which entitles one transaction of this world to the special guidance of Providence, and leaves another to the independent management of its inhabitants. The causes of this different estimate of mere varieties of degree in the same moral sentiment, lie beyond the scope of the present inquiry. It will here suffice to remark that the distinction itself is justified by the practical experience of life. In the one case, such impressions are found habitually connected with good sense and intelligence; in the other, with weak judgement and infirmity of purpose. In the one therefore they are esteemed the philosophy of religion; in the other are condemned as bigotry and superstition.

The pantheon of Homer embodies the system of natural religion prevalent in primitive Hellas. The direct part assigned by him to the gods, in the conduct of human affairs, represents the same divine influence which, in purer systems, is limited to a single deity. The rule, therefore, above laid down

for estimating the value of any theory of special interference by the importance of the objects on which the divine agency is brought to bear, supplies a fair general criterion for appreciating the celestial mechanism of classical fable. Not that, in every case where the influence of that theory were unbecoming the philosopher, it would be equally inappropriate in the hero of a poem: but the analogy holds good of each. Wherever the tendency of such influence is to destroy the freedom of human thought or action, and convert rational beings into irresponsible automata, the effect must be mischievous, whether exemplified in the creed of the devotee or the imagery of the epic muse.

But the agency of the Deity is not confined to the physical affairs of man. The disposition of his mind, its good and evil impulses, proceed necessarily from the same omnipotent first cause as the varieties of his worldly destiny. Hence that indisputable, though incomprehensible dogma of all religion, natural or revealed, that men are predestined, or in other words constrained, to the indulgence of passions and the commission of crimes which the same religion teaches them to avoid. The Greek mythology, while recognising this dogma in its full extent, differs in so far from that of most other antient nations, that instead of placing the two contending influences under the guidance of conflicting agents, the Deity and the Demon, it unites them in the same.[1] The Greek

[1] The goddess Atë, though invested by Homer with functions in some degree parallel to those of Satan or Tempter, possesses no claim to the dignity of an independent antagonistic evil principle. She represents merely a certain form of the vice or weakness common to gods and men, just as Eris represents discord, or Cholos immoderate anger.

system acknowledges no independent Evil Principle, but exhibits the several personifications of divine attribute, according to their own partialities or the decrees of Fate, now encouraging to virtue, now tempting to crime and hurrying into perdition. This system, although involving in its details offensive anomalies, seems yet, if referred to first principles, the more reasonable of the two. If the existence of one omnipotent Deity be admitted, the influence of the Evil Principle can only become effective by his authority, and every impulse to which humanity is subjected must ultimately originate in the same source. To assign, therefore, a separate independent agency to that element of divine power which men are pleased to consider as hostile to themselves, can tend little either to the dignity or the consistency of the Supreme Being. With regard, again, to the question here more immediately in point, how far such a distinction be conducive to the spirit or propriety of a poetical mythology, the simplicity of the Greek plan seems greatly preferable to that collision of good and bad demons which forms, with most other nations, the mechanism of heroic poetry. Any such methodical separation of attribute would have been incompatible with that variety of character and freedom of action in the members of the Greek pantheon, in which its poetical value so greatly consists.

The doctrine of fatality, while replete with a mystery and terror which render it a fine instrument in the hand of an accomplished poet, is a philosophic rather than a poetical doctrine. Hence its full developement in the poetry of Greece was reserved for a later period. Although it lies at the root of Homer's fable, it is seldom there put forward in so prominent

a form as in the tragic drama. With Homer, naturally weak or wicked men are indeed instigated to folly or crime by the decrees of Fate or the agency of its ministers; but he takes no pleasure in exhibiting just or well-intentioned persons irresistibly impelled to guilt and consequent destruction, as in the case of Œdipus and other heroes of the Attic stage.

Human personification of the divine agency.

2. There can be little doubt that even in the rudest ages of Greece men of a high range of intellect had formed worthy notions of the divine attributes, many of which are embodied in the poetical mythology with a corresponding degree of dignity. On the other hand, the lively fancy of the race led them, in the popular developement of their pantheon, to extend its principle of petty interference with the daily concerns of life to an excess unparalleled, perhaps, in any other system. Nor was the principle of human personification, however essential to the poetical effect of the Greek pantheon, free from moral disadvantage. In the material polytheism of other leading antient nations, the Egyptians, for example, the incarnation of the Deity was chiefly, or exclusively, confined to animals, monsters, or other fanciful emblems. The preference by the Greeks, as their visible type of the Deity, of the only one among his creatures whose intellectual powers entitle him to a community with the divine nature, appears on first view far more consistent with the celestial dignity. The consequences were, however, in some respects unfavourable. The Oriental system was essentially allegorical. It brought the deities into but slight physical contact with humanity. Human apotheosis, with its attendant confusion of the social relations of men and gods, was

there unknown; and, even where the customs of earth were transferred to heaven, it was in so symbolical a form as to obviate much risk of humanising effects. In Greece, on the other hand, it was an almost necessary result of the spirit and grace with which the deities were embodied in human forms, that they should also be burthened with human interests and passions. Heaven, like earth, had its courts and palaces, its trades and professions, its marriages, intrigues, divorces. This community of the two races led to amorous intercourse between them, supplying another fertile source of abuse and partiality in the divine administration of the affairs of earth. If the infusion of celestial blood into human veins added lustre to the race of heroes, the promotion of mortals to the honours of Olympus detracted proportionally from the dignity of the host of heaven.

Homer's genius here, as in other respects, reflects that of his nation. The divine character and agency, as shadowed forth by him, combine the respective excellences and defects of the popular system. Replete for the most part with grandeur and beauty, his celestial portraits are apt to degenerate into the gross or fantastical; and his supernatural mechanism, while often appropriate and effective, is at times trivial, misplaced, and detrimental to the spirit of his action.

Scheme of divine mechanism in each poem.

3. The general scheme of divine management in both poems is consistent and well imagined. The supreme first cause, or efficient unity of the Deity, is Fate or Destiny. Her decrees, although the manner and time of carrying them into effect might be modified at the discretion of her agents, were unalterable. By one of them the destruction of Troy had been fore-

ordained of old, as a judgement on the accumulated impieties of its royal family. The immediate motive of fulfilment was the crime of Paris. Jupiter, as confidential minister of the supreme fiat, is represented as impartial. Juno, Neptune, Minerva, and some other inferior deities, favour the Greeks. Apollo, Venus, and Mars take part with the Trojans. Jupiter himself however, at the crisis of the war which forms the subject of the Iliad, is involved in temporary hostility to the Greeks, by espousing the cause of Achilles, in repayment of a debt of gratitude for services rendered to himself by that hero's mother. The six deities above mentioned as taking a keener interest in the contest appear, when free from Jove's control, indefatigable in their efforts to promote the interests and stimulate the energies of their favourites; to rally them in defeat, reinvigorate them when fatigued or wounded, and, in a proportional degree, to depress the spirits and baffle the schemes of their adversaries.

The divine mechanism of the Odyssey, both in principle and in detail, offers the same essential features as that of the Iliad, under such incidental varieties as were involved by the corresponding variety of the subject and scene of action. Ulysses, the most virtuous hero of the age, is predestined, on his departure from Troy, to numerous trials and hardships before his resettlement in his native island. Jove, as the minister of fate, is friendly to him. The adverse power is Neptune, lord of the element which was the principal scene as well as cause of the hero's disasters. The moral springs of the celestial agency, though of an inferior order, are, in their operation and results, closely parallel to those of the Iliad. In the latter poem, Jove's not unreasonable

advocacy of the cause of Thetis and her son entails on the Greeks, while asserting their own just rights, a series of severe calamities. In the Odyssey, his far less justifiable indulgence of Neptune's vindictive rage at the well-merited punishment inflicted on his cannibal offspring, subjects the blameless hero to nine years of banishment, and his innocent wife and family to nearly as many of cruel insult and oppression. The office of guide and protector to Ulysses is undertaken by Minerva, the divine representative of the qualities by which he was himself chiefly distinguished. She had already, during the Trojan war, been his constant patroness, and now as zealously counteracts the malignant schemes of her uncle. These are the only great Olympic deities who take a prominent part in the Odyssey. The other supernatural agents, Circe, Calypso, Æolus, Proteus, belong, consistently with the genius of the poem, to the mythological rather than the religious element of the Greek pantheon.

The mode in which the divinities interpose in the affairs of men is similar in each work. Sometimes they appear in their own proper person, sometimes in the disguise of mortals. In the rare instances where they assume the shape of animals, an exclusive preference is given to the winged part of the creation.[1] It seems doubtful, by reference to the passages bearing on the point, whether Homer's gods were essentially invisible to men, whose eyes were at times endued with the faculty of perceiving them, or whether their persons were naturally distinguishable to human ken, and only concealed or disguised by means of clouds or mists, as circumstances might

[1] Il. vii. 59., xiv. 290.; Odyss. iii. 372., xxii. 240.

require.[1] Even where they appear openly, the power of recognising them is usually limited to certain privileged individuals. Thus Minerva is visible to Achilles alone in the quarrel scene of the Iliad, to Ulysses alone in the cottage of Eumæus and in the removal of the arms[2]; Apollo, Venus, and Mars, to Diomed alone in the fifth book of the Iliad. Sometimes this divine privilege is figured less as a quality of the gods than as an incapacity of mortal eyesight, symbolised as a mist before the eyes, removable in the case of favoured heroes.[3] The supernatural æther which habitually envelopes their own bodies is also frequently resorted to as a covering to such other persons or objects as they may be anxious to conceal. Even their material appendages, arms, chariots, and the like, when separated from their own persons, require this aid.[4] Little or no description is given of the personal appearance of any deity, unless in the poet's usual indirect mode, by epithets or incidental notices. Thus the white arms and full round eyes of Juno; the majestic form and azure eyes of Minerva; the golden tresses and smiling countenance of Venus; the lofty stature and slender but athletic grace of Diana; the brawny arms and limping gait of Vulcan; the delicate youth and noble aspect of Hermes, are specified. The broad chest of the dark-haired Neptune, the waist of Mars, and the forehead and brow of Jupiter are also appealed to as symbols of strength and majesty.

Characters of the deities.

4. The characters of the gods are as finely conceived as consistently maintained. The conduct and

[1] Il. xiv. 282., xvi. 790. [2] Il. i. 193.; Od. xvi. 158. sqq., xix. 33.
[3] Il. v. 127., xx. 321. 341.; Od. vii. 41.
[4] Il. iii. 381., v. 356. 776., viii. 50., xvii. 270., xxi. 597.; Od. vii. 140., xiii. 189.

bearing of Jupiter is distinguished, except in his conjugal relations, by a dignity befitting the ideal lord of the Hellenic pantheon. While never submitting, amid the conflicting interests of his subordinate deities and their rebellious opposition to his views, to the least compromise of his authority, he exhibits a happy mixture of severity and mildness in his mode of asserting it. Alone among the gods he abstains from all personal intercourse with his terrestrial subjects. His controlling power is exercised through the agency of inferior deities, while he himself sits apart on the summit of Olympus or Ida, contemplating, in proud consciousness of his surpassing glory, the progress of mundane events.

Juno is high-tempered, self-willed, and imperious; with lofty notions of her own prerogative as queen of Jupiter, she is easily mortified and incensed by his slowness to admit her pretensions. Ardent in the pursuit of her objects, she is little scrupulous in her mode of attaining them, a warm friend and a bitter enemy.

The character of Neptune, allowance being made for difference of sex, has much resemblance to that of Juno. As vindictive as his royal sister, and haughty and impetuous like the element he rules, he is the only deity, besides Juno, who, presuming on the privilege of a brother, as she does on that of a wife, ventures boldly to follow out his own schemes in defiance of Jupiter's commands.

Apollo is the sublimest of Homer's gods. In the Iliad, to which poem his visible interposition is confined, his presence and power are portrayed under features of mingled beauty, grandeur, and terror. Even in the Odyssey, where he never openly appears,

his indirect influence is shadowed forth under equally awful and impressive forms.[1]

Minerva, the patroness of intellectual pursuit and of the art of war in its nobler departments, is, even in the hurry of battle, calm and dispassionate, fertile in expedients, and a zealous champion of mortals who resemble her in character. Energetic in forwarding their views against her equals in rank, she exercises a politic forbearance when brought into collision with her superiors.

Mars is the type of the more offensive, as Pallas of the nobler side of the military character. His warlike ardour savours at all times of ferocity rather than valour, and degenerates in the heat of battle into blind indiscriminate fury.

Vulcan, in both poems, is the lowest of the Olympic host in the scale of divine dignity. He is represented as a mere blacksmith, distinguished but for skill in his art, brawny arms, his love of good cheer, and talent for buffoonery.

Venus, the divorced spouse of Vulcan, and now the paramour of Mars, combines with her familiar attributes of beauty, grace, and levity of habits, a tender and affectionate heart. On the few occasions where her concern for her son Æneas or her favourite Paris impels her to take part in the combat, her interference with the province of her more martial sisters is visited by severe castigation at their hands.

It will now be proper to illustrate the above remarks by individual cases, where the poet's mode of management appears more especially deserving of approbation or censure.

[1] See above, Ch. VIII. p 381. sqq.

Agency of Apollo and Neptune.

5. Perhaps the noblest example, in either poem, of divine interposition in human affairs is the pestilence inflicted by Apollo on the Greek host. The Apollo of Homer, it must be borne in mind, is a different character from the deity of the same name in the later classical pantheon. The attributes under which he is here chiefly represented, but which were afterwards obscured or superseded, are replete with a terror and mystery singularly adapted to the higher mechanism of epic poetry. His primitive proper function, common also to his sister Artemis, and forming by a natural train of association the basis of those which make up the fulness of his divine office, is that of angel or minister of death. Throughout both poems, all deaths from unforeseen or invisible causes, the ravages of pestilence, the fate of the young child or promising adult cut off in the germ of infancy or the flower of youth, of the old man dropping peacefully into the grave, or of the reckless sinner suddenly checked in his career of crime, are ascribed to the arrows of Apollo or Diana. The oracular functions of the god arose naturally out of the above fundamental attributes; for who could more appropriately impart to mortals what little foreknowledge Fate permitted of her decrees, than the agent of her most awful dispensations? The close union of the arts of prophecy and song explains his additional office of god of music, while the arrows with which he and his sister were armed, symbols of sudden death in every age, no less naturally procured him that of god of archery. Of any connexion between Apollo and the Sun, whatever may have existed in the more esoteric doctrine of the Greek sanctuaries, there is no trace in

either Iliad or Odyssey.[1] He is there the god, not of life and light, but of destruction, who promptly responds to the call of his injured saint with his weapons of vengeance. The few verses in which he is described as "descending, dark as night, the sides of Olympus, his quiver rattling on his shoulders," and as dealing death at each twang of his silver bow, is one of the finest examples of that simple brevity with which Homer loves to shadow forth his grandest conceptions. Another exercise of Apollo's power, which can hardly be justified but in figurative connexion with this primary attribute, is his share in the death of Patroclus. The introduction of so noble a god in the character of a ruffianly pugilist, to stun a brave warrior with a blow of his fist, were otherwise irreconcilable with the fine taste and judgement of Homer. It may possibly symbolise some popular legend of this hero having been seized, in the heat of battle, with a vertigo or giddiness, which rendered him an easy victim of the second-rate warrior who dealt him his death blow. Such fatalities belong to the class ascribed to the agency of Apollo.

In the Odyssey, attention has already been directed to the brilliant exemplification of the mysterious power of this god, in his cooperation with Minerva for the destruction of the suitors. That poem also

[1] Not only is the sun assigned a separate personality by the poet, but Apollo is frequently introduced under circumstances incompatible with the character of Sun-god (xxiii. 190.). The popular explanation, therefore, of the pestilence of the Iliad, as an effect of the burning rays of the midsummer sun, is out of place. Homer has himself confuted it by the epithet *νυκτὶ ἐοικώς*, applied to the god (i. 47.), an illustration to which no rational poet could well have resorted, to figure the influence of the sun. The dog-star, not the sun, is Homer's agent of pestilential heats.

abounds with incidental allusions of a pointed, often touching nature to the sudden dispensations of the twin deities.[1]

Closely parallel to the pestilence of Apollo, both in grandeur of conception and graphic conciseness of terms, is the description, in the Odyssey, of the destruction of the raft of Ulysses by Neptune. The god, returning from Ethiopia, descries, from the summit of the Asiatic mountains, the object of his persecution already, in spite of all his efforts, within sight of a friendly coast. With a brief ejaculation of wrath and surprise, "he brandishes his trident; the clouds gather, the sky is darkened, the winds rush forth, the billows rise," and, in a few seconds, the ill-starred voyager, his vessel shivered to pieces, is again abandoned to the fury of the waves.

The River gods.

Perhaps the boldest excursion of Homer into this region of poetical fancy is the collision into which, in the twenty-first book of the Iliad, he has brought the river god Scamander, first with Achilles, and afterwards with Vulcan when summoned by Juno to the hero's aid. The overwhelming fury of the stream finds its natural interpretation in the character of the mountain torrents of Greece and Asia Minor. Their wide shingly beds are, in summer, comparatively dry, so as to be easily forded by the foot-passenger. But a thunder-shower in the mountains, unobserved perhaps by the traveller on the plain, may suddenly immerse him in the flood of a mighty river. The rescue of Achilles by the fiery arms of Vulcan scarcely admits of the same ready explanation from physical causes. Yet the subsiding of the flood at the critical moment when the hero's destruc-

Vulcan.

[1] VII. 64., XV. 409., XVIII. 202.

tion appeared imminent, might, by a slight extension of the figurative parallel, be ascribed to a god symbolic of the influences opposed to all atmospheric moisture.

Minerva. The gods as instigators to crime.

In the more remarkable cases where the Deity appears in either poem as instigator of crime, the divine agency is figured in the person of Minerva. In the Iliad, Fate requires the truce between the two armies to be violated, and Pallas is despatched from Olympus with a commission to that effect. She selects Pandarus, a prince of naturally treacherous character, as her instrument, and assuming the form of a comrade, tempts him to the act by seductive views of the favour it will insure him with Paris and his party. The Lycian chief is easily persuaded. His perfidious shot at Menelaus causes a renewal of the battle, in which, as a reward of his villany, he is among the first heroes who fall.

In the Odyssey, the same goddess exercises a similar, but still more cruel influence on the destinies of the suitors. The hearts of these, in great part rather weak than wicked, youths, when momentarily turned to repentance, are by her hardened and confirmed in the career of guilt which was to involve their common destruction.[1]

Defects of the poet's divine mechanism.

6. Attention will now be turned to those cases where the active interposition of the gods appears in a less favourable light, whether from the extent to which it is carried, or the triviality of its object. It is in the battles that these defects of the poet's mechanism are chiefly observable. That the patron deity of a warrior should invest him with superhuman prowess, or accompany him in person on his career

[1] See supra, p. 426.

of victory, is an allowable stretch of poetical license. The escape of a champion in a crisis of great danger, or the harmless consequences of an apparently fatal wound, may also, without any serious breach of poetical propriety, be traced to the same miraculous aid. Homer has ingeniously availed himself of these expedients to maintain the credit of his countrymen in defeat. All the hostile fury of Jove and his elements, directed in the face of Diomed or Ajax, is required to insure the retreat of those heroes before a victorious enemy; while Hector or Æneas rarely escapes from a Greek champion of equal rank but through the intervention of the gods. These displays of divine tactic amount, however, at times, to so complete a suspension of the independent action of the heroes, as is greatly injurious both to their own dignity and that of their patrons. It can tend but little to magnify the prowess of a victor, that his spear should be directed with surgical accuracy, by his patron god, into the most vital part of his adversary's body, while the return shot is, by the same agency, made to spend its force in the air. In the last combat between Achilles and Hector, this mixture of the frivolous with the tragical greatly tarnishes both the grandeur of the catastrophe and the glory of the conqueror. The balancing of the heroes' fates in the scale of Jove, the sudden departure of Apollo from the side of Hector on perceiving his destined hour to be come, and the occupation of the god's previous post by Minerva, to whom alone, as patroness of the Greeks, the issue of the battle was now intrusted, are a series of figures highly conducive to that feeling of ominous foreboding with which the

mind loves to contemplate the approach of some great and fatal event. But when the same Minerva, after Achilles has missed his aim, nimbly picks up his spear and replaces it in his hand, while the Trojan hero, whose well-directed weapon rebounds harmless from the shield of his adversary, looks round in vain for a similar service from his faithless esquire, our previous sense of propriety in the supernatural interposition gives place to offence at such vexatious meddling. It was natural that the heroes, under these circumstances, should be powerfully impressed with their dependance on the arbitrary exercise of the divine authority. A belief that the brow of Jove frowns on their efforts is often a valid excuse for flight. If a sword shivers on the mail of an antagonist, the fault is attributed less to the temper of the blade, or the awkwardness of the thrust, than the displeasure of Minerva. If an arrow flies harmless from the bow, Apollo is taxed with partiality for the object at which it was aimed.

Where however the adventures described, and the style of the narrative, assume a familiar or humorous turn, such interference, if not more worthy of the divine majesty, is less prejudicial to heroic dignity, and at times has a lively agreeable effect. When Diomed, for example, in the chariot-race, is on the point of passing Eumelus, Apollo, of whom the Argive prince was no favourite, jerks the whip out of his hand. Minerva his patroness alertly restores it, and in revenge overturns the chariot of Eumelus. In the foot-race the same goddess, to favour Ulysses, causes his competitor to slip and fall among the cowdung, when on the point of success. Here the deities appear less as ministers

of Fate than as familiar genii of the chiefs, promoting and taking part in their amusements.

The Iliad, in its continued series of battles, where the favourite warriors of different deities are pitted against each other, affords more frequent opening than the Odyssey for this officious exercise of the divine influence. The most signal example in the latter poem is found, accordingly, in the portion of the action which offers the nearest resemblance to that of the Iliad, the assault of Ulysses on the suitors. The darts of the enemy are here so carefully turned aside by Minerva as to prove harmless, while those of the royal party are guided with deadly accuracy into vital parts. The apology which here suggests itself, the completely miraculous nature of the whole adventure, is perhaps but another ground of censure on this portion of the poem. The destruction of above a hundred able-bodied young chiefs by four individuals, without so much as a wound on the part of the assailants, is in itself a violation of all historical possibility, only to be glossed over by a copious admixture of preternatural agency. The most pointed instance in the Odyssey of that more venial class of petty interference already exemplified in the games of the Iliad, is, by a similar coincidence, the favour shown by Pallas to Ulysses in the athletic arena of the Phæacians.

The gods in their relation to each other.

7. The foregoing remarks on the poet's pantheon have been confined to its members in their relation to the human species. It remains to consider their character as exhibited in their dealings with each other. The anomalies here observable are no less strikingly illustrative of the joint merits and defects of the system of human personification. In the

examples subjoined, it will be proper to distinguish between what is derogatory to the character of the Deity in the higher sense, and what is also inappropriate in a poetical point of view.

Domestic brawls in Olympus.

When Achilles applies to his mother to intercede with Jove in his favour against Agamemnon, she postpones the fulfilment of her son's request for a fortnight, owing to the absence of the god at a festival of the Ethiopians in his honour. This is a figure noway inconsistent with the poetical dignity even of the king of Olympus. Omnipresence, or all-pervading control over mundane affairs, far from being an essential, was scarcely a possible attribute of the chief of a pagan pantheon; while, poetically speaking, the visit of the celestial host to the distant fabulous land on the banks of ocean, to grace with their presence the annual sacrifice of a favoured race of worshippers, is a fine image, and is repeated with like happy effect in the Odyssey.[1] On the return of Jupiter, the scene between him and Thetis, her supplication, his hesitation lest his indulgence of her wish should prove a source of discord with Juno, and his final concession of her suit, are all quite worthy of the poet and the Iliad. When however in the sequel, the divine king and queen actually come to high words on the subject, and the enraged husband threatens to lay violent hands on his spouse if she torment him further, while

[1] Od. I. 22., v. 282.; conf. Il. XXIII. 205. If, indeed, it be referred to a higher and purer standard, the case is different. Coupled with the slumber of Jove on Mount Ida, in the fourteenth book of the Iliad, this passage supplies a fine commentary on the address of Elijah to the worshippers of Baal: "Cry aloud, for he is a god! either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is on a journey; or, peradventure, he sleepeth and must be awakened!"

their lame son Vulcan excites the mirth of the deities by the ludicrous performance of his office of peacemaker, and finally restores good-fellowship by briskly circulating the goblet, neither the general spirit of the description, nor the grandeur of some of the passages it contains, can reconcile to such an exhibition, in the circle of the gods, of scenes discreditable to the humblest of their worshippers upon earth.

The frequent occurrence of such improprieties in the standard text-book of the national religion gave great offence to the early Greek philosophers, whose anxiety to maintain the dignity of Olympus, conjointly with the credit of Homer, gave rise to the allegorical system of interpretation, where not only the divine brawls, but a large portion of the facts or imagery of the poems, were fancifully explained as types of physical phenomena or ethic dogmas.[1] The attempts of modern commentators to reconcile the anomaly have not been more successful.[2] The only reasonable explanation or vindication of these passages is to assume their object to be satirical. They reflect partly the poet's own disposition to banter the extravagance of the popular theology, partly the inclination of the Greek public of all ages to extract materials for jest from the objects of gravest interest. They thus

[1] Heyn. Exc. III. ad Il. XXIII.; conf. obs. ad Il. XV. 18.

[2] Some would discover in these Olympian brawls traces of an earlier and ruder state of the popular pantheon, to the traditions of which the poet's veneration for the olden time has led him to give occasional prominence. (Heyne ad Il. I. 581. 587.) Apart from other objections to this view, it seems very questionable whether such a subjection of the Deity to the meaner failings of humanity were in better keeping with the more primitive, than the more complicated, stages of Pagan superstition.

possess a historical, in addition to their poetical value, as the earliest specimens of a taste afterwards so characteristic of the genius of Hellenism. It must here be remembered that Homer's works were not composed for the perusal of a limited and fastidious public, but for the entertainment of a whole nation. In more refined periods, on the subdivision of the various orders of literary composition, such talent for the burlesque found exercise in its own proper sphere: but in an age when the popular minstrelsy formed the whole cyclopædia of literature, the temptation to administer to so important an element of national taste was irresistible, even in works with the general style of which Homer himself, or his more critical hearers, might have felt such license to be not strictly congenial.

This view is confirmed by the fact that these domestic squabbles are exclusively confined to the social intercourse of the gods, although many portions of the narrative in both poems offer equal opportunity for the exercise of the same satirical license in human affairs. In the Iliad, the household relations of the Trojan king and queen were easily susceptible of such touches of the ludicrous; and in the palace of Alcinoüs, where the whole action is seasoned with a broad tone of raillery, there was abundant opening for their introduction. The limitation is not difficult to explain. It is of the very essence of the higher class of satire that it should be aimed at the highest objects. Doubtless such scenes were really enacted in the palaces of the Greek chiefs, from which the poet has transferred them to the halls of Olympus. This reality, however, was precisely what destroyed their aptness for poetical treatment. Amid the

simplicity of manners among all classes in those days, domestic broils were probably of too familiar occurrence in human families to supply popular subjects of comic allusion; while their introduction in such cases would have been at variance with Homer's fundamental principle of exalting the character of his human race of heroes. The distinction here drawn is pointedly illustrated by the different turn given by him to his descriptions of matrimonial infidelity, in the respective cases of a divine and a human libertine. Agamemnon, to enhance the value of his sacrifice in parting with Chryseïs, tells his assembled countrymen that he prefers her as a bedfellow even to his queen Clytemnestra. This is certainly, to modern ears, no very delicate allusion. It may, however, be urged in palliation, that the code of heroic morality was by no means severe as to the practice of extra-nuptial concubinage: and, in this particular case, a ten years' absence from home and domestic enjoyments might go far in the way of apology. Very different is the effect when Jove, on the summit of Mount Ida, in protesting the ardour of his amorous affection for Juno, assures her that it greatly surpasses what he had ever experienced for any other female with whom he had cohabited; and then proceeds gravely to sum up[1] for her conviction his adulteries with Danaë, Europa, and some half-dozen other paramours, so celebrated in classic fable. It is impossible the poet could mean so strange an address to be taken seriously. He could have no other conceivable object but that of satirising this absurd chapter of the national theology.

Hence, too, may be understood why this particular

[1] xiv. 315.

class of satire should be more liberally indulged in the Iliad than in the Odyssey. In the former poem the general gravity of the subject was precisely what imparted zest to such traits of the burlesque; in the Odyssey, a work of an essentially humorous character, while the poet had less temptation to resort to Olympus for a comic seasoning of his narrative, its introduction from that source would have been proportionally less effective. The subject offered also in other respects less opportunity. In the Iliad, the brunt of the theological satire is concentrated around the domestic intercourse of Jupiter and Juno; in the Odyssey, the latter divinity takes no part. The only other deities of higher rank interested in the action, Neptune and Minerva, present neither in their personal character nor their adventures similar opening for ridicule. The theological pasquinade of the poem is therefore confined to the inferior deities, Proteus, Circe, Æolus; with the exception of the episode of Mars and Venus, in the song of Demodocus, which is indeed a brilliant specimen of this style of composition.

Divination. Dreams. Omens.

8. Another mode of interposition in human affairs, less direct but little less effective than the personal activity of the gods, is that of divination or theomancy. The same rules above laid down for estimating the poetical propriety of mythological mechanism here equally apply. That the future will of heaven may be imparted through the agency of dreams and other ominous warnings; that unusual phenomena of the visible world portend parallel vicissitudes in the affairs of its inhabitants, are doctrines countenanced even by enlightened systems of religion. On the other hand, there is no chapter in the intellectual history of man which exhibits his rational powers

in a more degrading light than that which records the delusive influence of this species of superstition on the minds of the greatest heroes, or the conduct of the most important enterprises.

Homer's mode of management is here, upon the whole, judicious and elegant. Of the numerous forms of divination familiar in later times, those to which he has given prominence are comparatively few. The decrees of Fate relative to the course of events in each poem, being intrusted for their execution to the various members of the pantheon, may be divulged by them, as occasion suggests, to favoured mortals, either directly by means of prophetic inspiration, or through the medium of dreams and prodigies. The functions of the seer thus consisted partly of a simple knowledge of futurity received from the Deity, partly of his skill in the interpretation of omens.[1] There is no trace in Homer of the arts of divination having been yet reduced to system, as an element of public polity. Before a battle, the gods were propitiated by sacrifice; and, if an omen appeared on this or other similar occasions, it was hailed as more especially pregnant with prophetic import. But such indications do not seem to have been formally sought after, still less considered indispensable to the success of an enterprise. Neither the poet nor his heroes show any knowledge of those petty solemnities which exercised, in more civilised ages, so great a sway over

[1] High authority exists for the belief that Homer endowed his heroes, when at the point of death, with the power of foretelling future events; that the soul, on the threshold of the other world, was admitted to a participation in its privileges. The passages quoted in favour of this view are, the dying assurance of Patroclus to Hector, that Achilles will speedily avenge his fate (xvi. 851.), and the similar prediction by Hector (xxii. 358.) of the death of Achilles. Conf. Plato, Apol. Socr. p. 39.; Heyn. obs. ad Il. xxii. 358.

the fortunes of both Greece and Rome, and are so happily described by our own satirical bard, as

> "the roguery
> Of old aruspicy and augury,
> That out of garbages of cattle
> Presaged the event of truce or battle;
> From flight of birds or chickens pecking,
> Success of great'st attempts would reckon." . . .

Prophetic dreams are classed by the antients under two heads: first, those where the Deity in person, or through agents, issues his commands directly to the sleeper; secondly, those where the events are shadowed forth in the action of the dream, either as they afterwards take place, or in the form of trope or allegory. The Iliad contains but two dreams, both of the former class. In the first, Agamemnon is warned by Jupiter to prepare for battle; in the second, the shade of Patroclus appearing to Achilles enjoins the speedy performance of his funeral rites. In the Odyssey, where, in the more familiar spirit of the subject, this species of omen is of more frequent occurrence, there is one example of the allegorical class. In both poems the apparition is described in one of those simple epic forms with which Homer loves to stamp identity on his favourite images. The spectre stands over the head of the dreamer, and after a short address vanishes, when the sleeper awakens.[1] In the mission of dreams the gods, as in their ordinary control of human action, are the agents of deceit as well as of instruction. This doctrine is formally inculcated in the Odyssey, where dreams are described as of two kinds, veracious and delusive, each kind passing to the region of earth through a diffe-

[1] Il. II. 20., xxiii. 68.; Od. iv. 803., vi. 21., xx. 32.

rent gate of heaven.[1] The same doctrine is illustrated in each poem by a closely parallel example. In the Iliad, the dream sent by Jupiter in the semblance of Nestor persuades Agamemnon to take the field, by a false assurance of the immediate conquest of the city. In the Odyssey Minerva, in her own person, urges Telemachus to return home from Sparta forthwith, by an equally false account of his mother's contemplated marriage with Eurymachus.[2]

The native purity of Homer's taste is signally displayed in the choice of his ordinary prodigies or omens. They are derived chiefly from the phenomena of the atmosphere or the motions of its winged inhabitants, whose importance in the system of Pagan divination was such as to have furnished the familiar names for the art. Nor, certainly, is there any part of the animal creation better entitled to the distinction. Their privilege of roving through the boundless realms of space to the very gates of heaven, might in itself prompt the fable of their being the chosen messengers of God to man: while the majestic soaring of the eagle; the rapid flight and fatal swoop of the falcon; the scream of the sea-fowl flitting around the projecting cliffs, amid the dash of the surge and the roar of the storm; the dismal croak of the raven from the stunted tree of the desert, are objects calculated, in all ages, to inspire feelings of ominous terror and mystery. The only other animal which, with Homer, enjoys a similar privilege is the serpent, a creature whose peculiarities have obtained it a like preeminence in the superstitious code of all the antient nations. The atmospheric prodigies of favourite introduction are, in each

[1] Od. xix. 562. [2] xv. 10. sqq.

poem, thunder, sudden change from light to darkness, or the reverse; and, in the Iliad, the descent of red drops of rain, as a figure of bloodshed.[1] This phenomenon, if a mere fruit of the poet's imagination, might seem arbitrary or far-fetched. It is one however of ascertained reality, and of no uncommon occurrence in the climate of Greece.[2] The allotment to these various omens of their relative degrees of propitious or adverse import, by reference to the time or place of their occurrence, was the office of the professional soothsayer. In ordinary cases, however, popular opinion supplied common rules of interpretation. When the prodigy appeared on the right hand, it was favourable; on the left, the contrary.[3] Its appearance immediately after an invocation of the Deity was usually considered in itself an answer to the appeal, and an earnest of divine sympathy.

Among the nobler examples of such prophetic warnings may be cited, from the Iliad, that vouchsafed to the victorious Trojans during their assault on the Greek rampart, the ultimate failure of which was portended.[4] An eagle appears on their left, grasping in his talons a snake, which, wounded and enfeebled, still fiercely maintains the combat, until his enemy, agonised by a last decisive sting in the throat, drops him on the field and flies screaming from the scene of his discomfiture. The poet was partial to this class of images. The destruction of the suitors is prefigured to Telemachus by a hawk devouring a pigeon, and strewing its feathers on the ground; and to Penelope by an eagle destroying a flock of domestic

[1] Il. xi. 53., xvi. 459.
[2] See Heyn. ad locc.; and Lit. Gaz. 1842, May 7. p. 314., Oct. 1. p. 682.
[3] Od. ii. 154.; Il. xii. 201.
[4] Il. xii. 201.

fowls in the court of the palace.[1] Prophetic importance has rarely, if ever, been assigned by Homer to low or trivial images.[2] In the Odyssey, a dexter sneeze of Telemachus is indeed hailed as an omen by Penelope, but with a laugh, and evidently in the humorous spirit which pervades even the graver parts of the poem.[3]

Of Homer's belief in their efficacy.

9. Whatever prominence may have been given to the primitive arts of divination in the poet's description, it may still perhaps be a question how far he himself was imbued with a belief in their efficacy. Here and there the mind of the individual seems to shine forth superior to that of his age. Both Nestor and Priam, while deferring to the popular doctrine, are made to utter reflexions little respectful to its professors.[4] But the reply of Hector to the Trojan augur's comment on the omen of the eagle and snake, XII. 237.

τύνη δ' οἰωνοῖσι τανυπτερύγεσσι κελεύεις
πείθεσθαι· τῶν οὔτι μετατρέπομ' οὐδ' ἀλεγίζω..
εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος, ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης,

inculcates principles as just in themselves as they are foreign to the prevailing spirit of classical Paganism;

[1] Od. XV. 525., XIX. 536.

[2] The superiority of the primitive bard to his more refined successors, even in this delicate branch of his art, will appear from a collation of the images above cited from either poem with the poverty or vulgarity of those on which Virgil has hinged the fortunes of his hero. Such is the consumption of their dining-tables by the Trojan warriors; a piece of heroic gluttony predicted by the filthy prophetess of the Harpies, and which, as accomplished through a subtle trickery on the first landing of the host in Latium, forms the divine indication of the future empire of the world. Such are the sow and litter of thirty pigs, selected as the symbol of the imperial republic and her tribes of statesmen and warriors. Æn. III. 257. 390., VII. 115., VIII. 43.

[3] XVII. 541.

[4] Il. II. 81., XXIV. 220.

principles which strike at the root of the whole art of divination, and an equally free expression of which might have involved the fortunes or the life of an Athenian commander in the days of Pericles. In placing these noble doctrines in the mouth of Hector, who elsewhere shows himself so little under their influence, the poet seems but to avail himself of the habitually vainglorious tongue of that hero, to insinuate his own secret contempt for the ascendancy assigned by his age to blind fatality over personal exertion in the conduct of events. Similarly scornful allusions to the arts of augury occur frequently in the Odyssey [1], though chiefly placed in the mouths of unprincipled rakes: but the tenor of several, as of the remark of Penelope on the sneeze of her son, is plainly satirical.

His doctrine of a future state.

Nowhere does the poet's theology appear in a less favourable light than in his doctrine of a future state, as developed both in the Necromancy of the Odyssey and in parallel texts of the Iliad. The judgments of the infernal tribunal are limited to punishment. To reward there is, at least, no direct allusion; and the lot even of those whose lives were distinguished by great or good qualities is described as one of privation and gloom compared with that of the upper world. It is true that the poet's design was not to give a topographical description of the land of souls, but to narrate a visit to a particular region of it for a specific object. But when we consider the number and excellence of the heroes and heroines described by him as condemned to this dismal tenor of existence, there remains little room for even the hypothesis of an Elysium. If

[1] II. 178. sqq., xx. 358. sqq.

Achilles, Ajax, Agamemnon, Tiresias, Alcmena, Ariadne, Leda, were excluded from its joys, who could have been entitled to share in them? The incidental notices of a better fate reserved for certain favoured heroes, imply rather their apotheosis than a mere improvement of their condition in Hades. In the Iliad, the allusions to the infernal regions are equally gloomy, and, both in sentiment and style, in the closest harmony with the more detailed descriptions of the Odyssey. This is not only a defect of Homer's system of mythology, but a striking eccentricity of his genius. That the exclusion of a Paradise from the world of souls could, in his day, have formed part of the popular Greek theology is incredible. It were repugnant, not only to the spirit of that system, as inculcated from the earliest to the latest periods of classical paganism by other little less valid authorities, but to the first principles of natural religion imprinted in the human breast, even to those of common sense and equity. In a system which enforced the law of retributive justice by such terrible inflictions on the wicked, the denial of recompense to the good, or, worse, the actual deterioration of their lot, seems absurd as well as unjust. This singular doctrine, therefore, must be considered as the poet's own, as the peculiar tone which he preferred giving to the more awful element of his poetical mythology.[1] The argument which so strange an anomaly supplies of unity of genius in the two works, where it is so harmoniously exemplified, is sufficiently obvious.

10. Throughout this analysis, Homer's poetical mechanism has been examined, not merely as illustra- Homer's divine mechanism

[1] See Plato (Repub. p. 386. sq.), who admits the superiority of its poetical effect.

compared with that of modern epic poetry.

ting his own genius, but in connexion with those fundamental principles of art which apply to the literature of all ages and countries. In following out the same object, a few remarks are here subjoined on the general features which distinguish his mythological agency from that to which recourse has been had by standard modern poets of a similar class.

The elegant facility with which the Greek mythology embodies in material forms the phenomena of both the moral and the physical world has been considered in a previous chapter.[1] The creations of that mythology are neither the arbitrary inventions of fantastic poets, nor the studied personifications of didactic allegory. They shadow forth, in their native freshness, the original views and impressions of the most gifted family of mankind concerning the structure and government of the universe. This harmony, or rather identity, between religious dogma and popular superstition, imparts to Homer's supernatural agency a poetical truth and reality which must be wanting in any system where those two elements are distinct. Hence the disadvantage under which the modern poet labours, in his attempts to impart the interest of the marvellous to his narrative. The pure spirit of the Christian religion essentially disqualifies it for the mechanism of a heroic poem. The popular sympathies of our own middle ages hinge, indeed, on the Roman Catholic legendarium, somewhat as those of the Hellenes on the Homeric mythology: but the spirit of the former class of traditions is as repugnant to the genius of the Heroic Muse as to that of the pure religion which they contaminate. Of this the more

[1] Supra, p. 103. sqq.

judicious poets of the romantic school seem to have been sensible, rarely admitting the agency of saints or martyrs into their epic mechanism. The aids to which they preferably resort, magicians, fairies, and goblins, have the other drawback of being in glaring collision with the standards of religious belief, and, by consequence, with an essential ingredient of that popular sympathy which it is their object to awaken. The attempt, on the other hand, to blend the religious with the magical element of romantic fable involves offensive anomalies. Of this we have a striking example in the most popular model of the modern epopee, the Jerusalem of Tasso; in the action of which poem the grave dogmas of spiritual theology, the delusions of Roman Catholic priestcraft, the terrors of Northern dæmonology, and the gay idealities of Pagan Polytheism or Arabian romance, are all worked up into a single heterogeneous compound. What can be more false, either in poetry or in reason, than that a few cabalistic words of some lascivious sorceress or malignant necromancer should have the power of thwarting the schemes of Jehovah for the future destinies of Christendom; that angels and archangels should undertake the same officious functions as the fighting machinery of the Iliad, direct the blow of a Christian chief, or parry the thrust of his Mussulman adversary; or that the souls of departed saints should appear fighting in the air, with mortal weapons, against legions of hostile dæmons?

Had, however, the marvellous agency of the Greek poet been confined to the normal standards of Pagan worship, the result might have been an undue restraint on that play of inventive genius which constitutes the charm of all epic fiction. But of this

there was here no danger. The principle of physical personification, on which the whole Hellenic system was based, afforded ample freedom for expatiating in the most visionary realms of mythological fancy. Every newly explored region of earth or water suggested a fresh stock of representatives for the new objects or ideas which were brought to light. The Cyclopes, for example, Proteus, and other marvels or monsters of the Odyssey, had no place, probably, in the primitive Hellenic pantheon. The fables concerning them obtained currency in the progress of navigation along the shores of the Mediterranean; and, when once familiar in popular legend, they were easily engrafted on the genealogical stem of Olympus. The Cyclopes, types perhaps originally of some newly discovered race of ferocious maritime barbarians, were first admitted as sons of Neptune, gigantic shepherds of the verdant shores of the western deep: afterwards, when the more subtle interpreters of fabulous geography selected Ætna as their place of abode, they became Vulcan's journeymen, forgers of Jupiter's thunderbolts. Circe, who, in her simple capacity of marine enchantress of the remote West, stands in as little connexion with the Greek pantheon as any similar creation of medieval romance, became daughter of the Sun, guarding the gates of his palace and the neighbouring frontier of Erebus; and, in the exercise of her functions, was, like Calypso, Proteus, or Polyphemus, subjected to the presiding powers of Olympus.

In selecting his supernatural mechanism for subjects of higher national interest, it was natural that the poet should prefer those members of the pantheon whose authority was universally received and

acknowledged. In the Iliad, accordingly, this rule has been observed. In the Odyssey, he was equally led by the spirit of his subject to give prominence to a more fantastic class of fable. But even there such license is admitted solely in the extra-Hellenic portion of the adventures. Those confined to a Hellenic scene of action are conducted in the Odyssey, as in the Iliad, under the guidance of the same strictly Hellenic class of divine agents.

His doctrine of human apotheosis.

11. By some modern commentators Homer has been supposed ignorant of the doctrine of human apotheosis, or of the practice of hero-worship, as it prevailed in later Greek superstition. It is true that neither poem contains any specific notice of divine honours paid to deceased heroes. There can, however, be no doubt that this dogma of his national creed, although he may not have allowed it prominence in his fable, was quite familiar to him. Both poems in fact contain frequent allusion to deified mortals. Such are Tithonus and Ganymede in the Iliad; Ino, Hercules, and the Dioscuri in the Odyssey. The same honour conferred by Aurora on Tithonus was destined by Calypso for Ulysses.[1] Persons thus invested with immortal attributes were undoubtedly objects of worship to their admirers or descendants upon earth. There were however, in the general spirit and conduct of Homer's fable, obvious inducements for leaving this feature of the popular pantheon in the background. The contrast between the powers and duties of his heroes and those of his gods was a main spring of his dramatic action. In order to give effect to that contrast it was necessary, on the one hand to magnify the character of his heroes solely as

[1] Od. v. 136.

men; on the other, amid the community of the two natures, to secure a clear ascendancy of authority and power to the divine agency. Even admitting therefore, that Achilles and Agamemnon may have been worshipped as gods in the poet's time, as they were in historical ages, they could hardly, without a complete sacrifice of the spirit and propriety of his fable, have been represented as so worshipped in the Iliad. The same rule has been observed by the more distinguished of Homer's successors. The homage paid by the surviving heroes of the Trojan war to Achilles, or by Orestes and Electra to Agamemnon, in the mythology of the tragic poets, differs in no way from that offered by Achilles to Patroclus in the Iliad. The honours conferred are in each case those due merely to departed heroes, not to deified mortals.

Of allegory in his divine mechanism.

12. It would scarcely be doing full justice to this head of subject, were we to take leave of it without devoting a few special remarks to the symbolic or figurative element of Homer's mythological mechanism; or in other words to the question, how far the operations of the gods, in the poet's descriptions, are to be understood in a literal or personal sense; how far they are to be interpreted as shadowing forth some more recondite or mysterious class of physical influence. This question, while in every age a fertile source of error and extravagance, never has formed, nor can form, even when rationally treated, a very agreeable or instructive subject of enlargement, and will here occupy a proportionally limited share of attention.

Setting aside such purely metaphysical abstractions as Eris, Atë, Ossa, the Litæ, and so forth, concerning whose allegorical functions but little dif-

ference of opinion can exist, it will not probably be disputed, that all, or most, even of the leading Olympic deities are typical, in their origin at least, of some power of nature, moral or material; that Jupiter and Juno, for example, represent generally the celestial elements; Neptune, the liquid part of the creation; Vulcan, fire; Minerva, the wiser more sagacious, Mercury, the more astute and subtle exercise of human intellect. It were however absurd, on this account, to insist that every performance recorded of any one of these deities is a mere symbol of some actual effect or developement of the physical influence over which he is supposed to preside; that the quarrels of Jupiter and Juno, for example, do but typify the conflicts of the atmospheric elements, the alternations of heat and cold, drought and moisture, or other vicissitudes of the weather and the seasons. It would, on the other hand, be unduly straining the principle of literal interpretation, to doubt that, where an easy and natural opening occurred for giving greater prominence to the symbolic ingredient in the character or agency of his gods, the poet would at times avail himself of what might often prove an elegant variety of figurative embellishment. As to the occasions in which any such more extended method of symbolic interpretation may be admissible, the reader's own taste or judgement must supply his best or only rule of distinction. The cases in which that method has been resorted to in the foregoing pages are few, and not, it is presumed, chargeable with undue latitude. Such was the explanation given of the seizure of the hair of the infuriated Achilles by Minerva, at the moment when he is drawing his sword against his commander, as a

figure of his own better judgement prompting a less violent, but more effective mode of exacting vengeance for the insult and injury to which he had been subjected. Nor, consistently with a due respect for the taste or correctness of the poet's genius, can the assault of Apollo on Patroclus be taken in any other than a figurative sense. That there is also a more or less symbolic import in the prominence given to Neptune as representative in the Odyssey of the agency hostile to Ulysses, is implied by the pointed terms in which the vindictive influence of the god is restricted to the purely maritime portion of the hero's adventures.[1]

[1] I. 21. 75., VI. 331., IX. 532. sqq., XIII. 131. sqq.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX A. (p. 200.)

ON A PECULIARITY IN THE TREATMENT OF HOMER'S TEXT BY WRITERS OF THE WOLFIAN SCHOOL.

THE authors chiefly distinguished by the perversion of the critical art alluded to in the text are, Hermann (De Interpolat. Homeri, Opusc. vol. v. p. 52.), Lachmann (Betrachtungen über die Ilias), and B. Thiersch (Urgestalt der Odyssee). The method of Heyne and some others, while little less destructive, admits of this apology, that they acknowledge the excellence of the work while questioning the source from which that excellence proceeds. They perceive the beauty of the creation amid the materialism of their views as to its origin. Hermann and Lachmann, on the other hand, with some less eminent fellow-labourers in the same field, glory in their blindness to all higher poetical unity in the Iliad, pronouncing the whole poem a cento or patchwork, for which nothing but a delusion on the part of the old critical public could have obtained credit as a standard of imitation. Hermann, in following out this view, denies accordingly the title of the Iliad to have been the primary model of the Hellenic epopee, in the early purer ages of art. This honour he asserts by preference to some one of the Cyclic poems, to the Æthiopis, for example, or the Cypria, discarding the Iliad as but an abortive attempt of some later clumsy compiler to emulate or surpass those more classical prototypes.[1] After dissipating this phantasmagoria of poetical perfection, which during thirty centuries had deluded successive generations of admirers and critics, he and his coadjutor Lachmann have tantalised us by showing how, had Pisistratus been better qualified for the task he undertook, he might by a more skilful arrangement of the same materials, have produced a poem, or even several,

[1] Op. cit. p. 69.

really deserving the reputation which the existing patchwork Iliad has so unworthily usurped. To attempt to confute in detail, by any serious line of argument, the subtleties by which these doctrines have been supported, would be an abuse little short of that of propounding them. The reader is referred to the general remarks in Chapter x. p. 438. sqq. and in Appendix F. p. 512. infra, on the principles against which those subtleties so grievously militate.

APPENDIX B. (p. 218.)

ON THE SUPPOSED VULGATE, OR EDITIO PRINCEPS, OF HOMER, BY PISISTRATUS.

RITSCHL (Die Alexand. Bibl. p. 60. sqq.) would meet the obstacle which the absence of all notice of an Attic or Pisistratid edition of Homer interposes to the claims of the Athenian usurper as original compiler of the poems, by the hypothesis that the editions cited by the Scholiasts under the title of "common," or "vulgar," *αἱ κοιναί*, or *αἱ δημώδεις*, represented the text of Pisistratus, considered as the Editio princeps, or Vulgate, which formed the groundwork of all the others. He illustrates this view by the analogy of the Aristarchean text, as the similarly standard authority in later times. The illustration, however, is little apt. In the references to the Aristarchean text, Aristarchus is at least habitually quoted as its editor, while neither Pisistratus nor Athens are ever hinted at in connexion with this supposed Athenian vulgate. Nor upon this view would the citations have been worded in the plural "common editions," *αἱ κοιναί*. The frequent variation of this phrase into *αἱ κοινότεραι*, "the *more* common," seems in itself conclusive proof that neither expression indicates more than its literal meaning implies; the mass of ordinary, probably nameless, texts current in later ages, as distinct from the few of more recognised authority. Add to this that the Greek technical term for vulgate text or reading is *παράδοσις*. It is habitually applied in that sense to the text by Aristarchus, and would without doubt have been similarly applied to that of Pisistratus had any such existed, or had any similar authority attached to it. See the passages cited by Bekker in Append. ad Scholl. p. 826.

APPENDIX C. (p. 254.)

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS ON THE UNITY OF THE MECHANICAL STRUCTURE OF THE ILIAD.

In order to save an accumulation of details, two principal heads of mutual reference have been omitted in the above Concordance. The one would have comprised the passages illustrative of the unvarying partisanship of the same cause by the same deities: Juno, Minerva, Neptune, being ranged from first to last on the side of the Greeks; Apollo, Mars, Venus, on that of the Trojans; while Jove is impartial. This consistency might, with better reason perhaps than in some other parallel cases, be explained as a result of the "common genius" of the heroic tradition. Yet it is somewhat remarkable, that Euripides (Troad. init.), after some older epic authority it may safely be presumed, describes Neptune as throughout the siege the warm friend of the Trojans, whose bitterest enemy he appears in the Iliad.

The other case of harmonious concordance in such recurring details, to which no special prominence has been given in our Epitome, is the disappearance from the field, throughout the remainder of the action, of the heroes successively slain in the earlier engagements. It seems inconceivable that any universal or unanimous tradition as to the vicissitudes of the ten years' war should have agreed in representing the following six heroes of principal note, Elephenor chief of the Eubœans[1], Tlepolemus of the Rhodians[2], Pandarus of the Lycians[3], Odius of the Halizonians[4], Pirous and Acamas of the Thracians[5], besides many of secondary distinction, as all killed in the first battle after the secession of Achilles; or consequently, that any number of "independent poets" should have so harmoniously dispensed with the services of all six in the sequel. The well-known single exception therefore to this rule of consistency, in the case of Pylæmenes[6], can admit of but two reasonable solutions. It is either an oversight of the poet; or verses 658—9 of the XIIIth book are, as their own internal evidence seems also strongly to imply, an early interpolation by some popular rhapsodist, better versed in the "Battle of the Ships" as his habitual part in the recital than in the "Prowess of Diomed."

[1] IV. 469. [2] V. 659. [3] V. 290. [4] V. 39.
[5] IV. 527., VI. 7. [6] V. 576. sqq.; conf. XIII. 658.

The mind of the same poet is also curiously exhibited by Homer's partiality for certain names in the adjustment of his fictitious characters, or "men of buckram," as they may be called; the accumulation of which names, unconsciously perhaps on his part, creates some trouble to hypercritical readers. Thus in xi. 578, we have one Apisaon among the crowd of slain warriors, and another in xvii. 348., both Trojans; in xv. 515. we have a Schedius, and again in xvii. 306., both Phocians; the common names being distinguished in each case by different patronymics. The author has not himself had leisure to carry this analysis of heroic synonymes through the action of the Iliad. The following curious list, however, is subjoined from the text of the Venetian scholiast[1]: "There are two charioteers named Eurymedon, both Greeks; one in the service of Agamemnon, the other in that of Nestor. There are two heralds named Eurybates, both Greeks; one in the service of Agamemnon, the other in that of Ulysses. There are three Adrasti, all Trojans; one killed by Diomed, another by Menelaus, a third by Patroclus. There are two Acamantes, both Trojans, distinguished by their different patronymics; two Astynoi, both Trojans; two Pylastæ, both Trojans; two Pisandri, both Trojans; two Eunomi, both Trojans." Such coincidences might, in their sameness and their distinction, occur naturally to the same poet, but were not likely to have suggested themselves to a number of different poets.

APPENDIX D. (p. 265.)

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARKS ON THE RELATION OF THE CATALOGUE TO THE REST OF THE POEM.

It is certainly very remarkable, considering the wide opening afforded by the peculiar character of the "Catalogue" to interpolation or corruption, how slender an amount of such imputation, if any, apart from the few verses stigmatised on more or less valid grounds by the antients themselves, the ingenuity of the subtlest modern commentators has been able to substantiate. The discrepancies, for example, pointed out by K. O. Müller[2] (who has dwelt in special detail on this head of sceptical argument), between the Catalogue and the body of the poem, however undeniable according to the letter, seem not only to vanish when

[1] Schol. ad Il. xiii. 643.

[2] Hist. of Gr. Lit. p. 54. sqq.

judged in the spirit of the joint text, but even to afford fresh evidence of unity. Thus "Meges, son of Phyleus," it is urged, "is described in the Catalogue as a chieftain of Dulichium in Acarnania; but, in the Battle of the Ships, he is found leading on the troops of Elis, a state situated on the opposite coast of Peloponnesus." The anomaly however is explained by the fact that Phyleus, the father of Meges, was a prince of Elis who had settled on the Acarnanian territory. What more natural than that, in the vicissitudes of an eventful conflict with an alien enemy, the colonist should be found assisting in marshalling the troops [1] of the parent state? Equally groundless is another similar imputation of discrepancy, in the case of Medon, a Locrian chief settled as a colonist in Thessaly. "This hero," it has been objected, "is invested in the Catalogue with the command of the troops of Philoctetes, a Thessalian prince disabled by disease from appearing on the field. But, during the Battle of the Ships, the same Medon is found helping to rally and lead on the troops of another neighbouring Thessalian state." We can imagine nothing more natural or probable. Such self-adjusting anomalies, if anomalies they can be called, are even better evidence of genuine origin than any rigid observance of historical or geographical precision. With regard to the anachronism which the same Müller would discover in the poet's description of the Cadmean territory as already in the hands of the Bœotians at the epoch of the Trojan war, it seems, under any circumstances, very questionable whether the authority of Thucydides is to be held as better than that of Homer in so purely legendary a matter.[2] But that the anachronism, admitting it to exist, should be chargeable on an interpolator, rather than on the author of the original poem, is, in the face more especially of Il. v. 710., XIII. 685., XIV. 476., XV. 330., XVII. 597., an altogether gratuitous assumption. Little less arbitrary and far-fetched is the hypothesis of the same critic, that the Arcadians, as a "Pelasgian" people, could not have taken part in a war waged by the Hellenic confederacy.

The admission also objected to by Müller, of the petty islands of

[1] He does nothing more. Müller's statement that Meges is represented in this passage (XIII. 692.) as "king of the Epeans dwelling in Elis" rests on no other authority but that of Müller himself.

[2] The appeal to Thucydides (I. xii.) seems indeed at the best, somewhat out of place, admitting, as he does, on Homer's authority that there were Bœotians in the Theban territory at the time of the Trojan war, although the greater body of that people were then resident in Thessaly.

Cos, Syme, Nisyrus, and others to a place in the list, on either the Greek or the Trojan side, may seem strange, no doubt, in itself. But the anomaly certainly supplies a better argument of eccentricity in a single original poet, or of some peculiarity in the legend which he followed, than of later rhapsodical interpolation. For what more improbable than that Ionian or Attic compilers should have been at pains to confer the high privilege of a place in the Catalogue on these insignificant islets; while Chios, Samos, and other illustrious seats of Ionian power and splendour in the immediate neighbourhood, are passed over with contempt. Among other more trivial arguments of Müller, that founded on the case of the augur Ennomus (Il. II. 860., conf. XXI.), if good for anything, must at least be extended, not only to the case of Antiphus in the Odyssey (II. 19., IX. 288. sqq.), but to that of Leucaspis in the Æneid (VI. 334., conf. I. 113. sqq.). The passages of the Iliad and Odyssey, it may be added, here mutually illustrate each other and the usage of the poet in such cases.

APPENDIX E. (p. 405.)

ON THE PHÆACIANS OF THE ODYSSEY: THEIR RACE AND COUNTRY.

THE probability that Homer had some particular people in view in his Phæacian episode has already been suggested by Welcker[1], in an ingenious essay on the subject in the Rheinische Museum. He supposes the poet's Ionian fellow-countrymen to be the race whose habits are here portrayed. The author of this work has been led to a different opinion by certain coincidences between the characters and descriptive epithets of the Phæacian heroes and those of the Phœnician navigators, who figure so largely in parts of the Odyssey; also by similar coincidences between the names of Phæacian localities and parallel phrases occurring in the early geographical vocabulary of the Phœnician colonies. These analogies are of so very striking and peculiar a nature, as to have impressed on his mind, not otherwise much disposed to indulge in such speculations, a strong conviction that it is a colony of these Oriental adventurers in some part of the Western Mediterranean which here forms the butt of Homer's playful satire. Both Phæacians and Phœnicians are represented by him as enthusiastically

[1] 1821, p. 219. sqq. and in Kl. Schrift. vol. II. p. 1.

devoted to navigation; both are characterised by an epithet denoting "magnificence" or "ostentation," the special characteristics of the Phæacians. The parallel passages are here subjoined:—

Od. VII. 39. τὸν δ' ἄρα Φαίηκες ναυσίκλυτοι οὐκ ἐνόησαν.
XV. 41. ἔνθα δὲ Φοίνικες ναυσίκλυτοι ἦλυθον ἄνδρες.
VIII. 191. Φαίηκες δολιχήρετμοι ναυσίκλυτοι ἄνδρες.
conf. 97.
XIII. 272. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νῆα κίων Φοίνικας ἀγανοὺς ἐλλισάμην. . . .
XIII. 120. ἐκ δὲ κτήματ' ἄειραν ἃ οἱ Φαίηκες ἀγανοὶ ὤπασαν.[1]

The point of the parallel would here obviously be sharpened by the punning connexion, in the true spirit of Homeric humour, between the names Φαίηκες and Φοίνικες. Add to this that the name of the poet's seafaring islanders finds its appropriate etymology in the Oriental word Phaïk, "magnificent," of which their favourite epithet ἀγανοί is a Greek translation. The name of their city and port, Scheria, deducting the Greek ending, finds an equally apt interpretation in the Phœnician word Scher, "emporium," "busy port."[2] The Phæacians are further described by the poet as formerly settled at Hyperea, in the neighbourhood of the "Cyclopes,"[3] and as having been expelled from that region by their overhearing neighbours. Admitting, with Fazelli and Stolberg, that the Lilybæan promontory of Sicily is the locality figured by the poet as the land of the Cyclopes, a view to which the author's own study of the poet's text in those regions led him readily to subscribe, the Phæacians might thus be supposed to figure one of the numerous Phœnician colonies originally settled on that line of coast, which had been driven by the barbarous indigenes to seek a new country in some distant part of the Mediterranean. Whether that country was Corcyra, or some other region, may be a question. Here, again, we have a remarkable coincidence between the name Hyperea of the Odyssey, and Hipparis, the title of a district and river of the same Sicilian coast originally possessed by Phœnicians, afterwards called Camarina when occupied by the Greeks. Hyperea is obviously a mere Greek poetical variation of Hipparis.[4] That Homer was suffi-

[1] Conf. VI. 55., VIII. 418., XIII. 71.
[2] Conf. Bochart. Geogr. sacr. p. 463. sq.
[3] Od. VI. 4. sqq.
[4] Eustath. et Schol. Buttm. ad Od. loc. cit.; conf. Bochart. op. cit. p. 548. sq.

ciently conversant with the language of the Phœnician navigators to admit of his turning his knowledge to account in the humorous element of the Odyssey may safely be assumed, as well from his apparent familiarity with their habits, as from their almost entire occupation of the Mediterranean commerce at this period, and the consequent probability, or even necessity, of his having acquired his stock of more distant geographical knowledge, mythical or real, in voyages performed in their company. Various other evidences of Homer's knowledge of the Phœnician tongue might be derived from his own text; but the train of inquiry which their full consideration would involve would be out of place on the present occasion.[1]

An objection to the above view of the spirit of the Phæacian episode might perhaps be discovered in the lively fantastic genius of the imaginary race of Scheria, so different from the gravity, or even gloom, which we are in the habit of associating with the character of the natives of Palestine. There are, however, exceptions to every rule; and, in the case of a Phœnician community which happened to be really distinguished by frivolous or flighty habits, the contrast between those habits and the usual characteristics of the race might even add zest to the satire.

APPENDIX F. (p. 439.)

ON THE "SELF-CONTRADICTIONS" OF VIRGIL, MILTON, CERVANTES, WALTER SCOTT, AND OTHER POPULAR AUTHORS, AS COMPARED WITH THOSE OF HOMER.

The self-contradictions of the Æneid have been collected and illustrated by the author of this work in an article of the British and Foreign Review for October, 1839 (No. IX.); which essay he has been gratified to find has not been without influence on the judgement of the British public.[2] The list here subjoined has

[1] A single somewhat curious illustration is subjoined. The first syllable of the name Siren is the Semitic root Sîr, Song, or sweet music. The full Greek term would be represented by the Semitic dual Sirein. Homer's Sirens accordingly were but two; as appears from his use of the dual form Σειρήνοῖν.

[2] See Westm. Review, vol. xlvi. p. 405.; Classical Mus. No. II. art. 16. in fine.

been limited to a selection of certain cases of a more concise and palpable nature. For others still more important, but involving a more extended line of textual analysis, the reader is referred to the essay itself.

I. At v. 567. sq. of book II., Helen is represented, during the sack of Troy, as hiding herself in the Temple of Vesta; as shunning alike the presence of victor and vanquished, from each of whom she equally feared the retributive vengeance due to the author of their common disasters; and as apprehensive, above all, of the wrath of her husband Menelaus. In book VI. 511. sqq., the same Helen is described as having been the accomplice of the Greeks in their stratagem, as having herself given the signal for their issue from their ambush, and as having with her own hand opened the gates of the Trojan palace to Menelaus.

II. At v. 16. of book II. the Wooden horse is said to have been made of fir; at v. 112. it is made of maple wood; and at v. 186. it is made of oak.

III. In book II. 781., the shade of Creusa solemnly announces to Æneas that he is to seek his future destination and seat of empire "in Hesperia and on the banks of the Tiber." But at the opening of book III. we find the hero altogether unconscious of any such prediction, and wandering

Incertus quo fata ferant, ubi sistere detur.

Soon after, as practical evidence of his ignorance, he lands, and quietly commences the foundation of his new city on the opposite coast of Thrace, a few miles from the Troad; and when, in the sequel, Apollo himself (154. sqq., conf. 172.) again announces his appointed restingplace to be "Hesperia and the banks of the Tiber," he is quite bewildered and astonished at the news.

IV. The winds employed by Æolus to scatter the Trojan fleet in book I. 85. sqq. are Eurus, Notus, Africus, and Aquilo; yet Orontes, the noblest victim of that disaster (I. 113.), is introduced (VI. 334.) in the infernal regions as having fallen a sacrifice to the fury of Auster, a wind which, by reference to the previous text, was altogether guiltless of his death; while the other hero, Leucaspis, here described as drowned on the same occasion, is never mentioned at all in the description of the storm.

V. By reference to 52. sq. 193. 309. sqq. of book IV., Æneas left Dido in midwinter. On his disembarcation, however, in Sicily a few days afterwards, the description of the green grass and serene sky, of the crowns of leafy poplars, and of the gar-

lands of rosy flowers (book v. passim), plainly indicate that in that island it was already summer or advanced spring.

VI. In book IV. 310., Æneas is described as sailing from Africa with the wind Aquilo; somewhat strangely, as the south, not the north, wind was required for his voyage to Europe. The blunder is corrected by the poet (or compiler of the poem) at the expense of another broad self-contradiction in IV. 562., where we are told it was Zephyrus. This statement is again contradicted in book V. 2., and it is now reasserted to have been Aquilo.

VII. In book V. 659., the Trojan women, wearied by their long voyage, attempt to burn the fleet, in order to secure a permanent settlement in Sicily. Æneas, in consequence, decides to leave them behind in that island (715.). They now implore to be allowed to accompany their male relatives, but Æneas is obdurate and sails without them (765. sqq.). Yet in the opening of the seventh book, we find the hero's nurse Cajeta dying on the voyage to Latium. Soon after (IX. 216. 284.) the mother of Euryalus also reappears on the scene; and the poet (217.) informs us that "this matron alone, of all the Trojan females, had preferred sharing the fortunes of the fleet to abiding by the flesh-pots of Acestes in Sicily;" a flat contradiction both of his previous notice of Cajeta, and of the statement in book V. 765., that the whole of the Trojan women were anxious to proceed, but had been refused a passage by Æneas.

VIII. In book X. 496. sqq., Turnus, after killing Pallas, appropriates the young hero's belt as the sole trophy of his victory, generously delivering up the body, otherwise unspoiled, to the comrades of the slain chief, who bear it off on his shield. In book XI. 91. this account is falsified, and the funeral pile of Pallas is said to be decorated with his spear and helmet alone, "as the rest of his arms," consequently shield, cuirass, and greaves, "had remained in the possession of Turnus."

IX. The close of the tenth book leaves the reader in the middle of a great battle, and the concluding lines describe the death of a distinguished Latin warrior by the hand of Æneas:

Undantique animam diffundit in arma cruore.

The eleventh book resumes the interrupted tale in the following manner:

Oceanum interea surgens Aurora reliquit.

The consistency of the poet (or compiler) can here only be saved

by assuming this battle to have been fought during the night, and to have been interrupted by the rising sun.

It is to be regretted that Professors Hermann and Lachmann should not have extended to Virgil also their ingenious researches into the theory of "Homeric" self-contradiction. Had they done so, they would have infallibly proved the Æneid, by the same conclusive arguments employed in the case of the Iliad, to be a mere cento of popular Roman ballads clumsily strung together by the book-maker of the Augustan age who vulgarly passes as the poet of the entire Æneid.

The few examples here subjoined from other works are merely such as have incidentally presented themselves in the course of the author's reading; a closer analysis of the text of some of these compositions might perhaps supply as heavy a catalogue as that derived from the text of Virgil.

Milton informs us, that, when the Messiah came down from heaven to judge our guilty first parents after the Fall, Satan, shunning His presence, returned to hell by night (x. 341.). On his way he meets Sin and Death on their road to Paradise in the morning (x. 329.). After Sin and Death had arrived in Paradise, Adam is represented as lamenting aloud to himself "through the still night" (x. 846.). The ensuing day (assuming day to have now at length really dawned) is afterwards described by the same Adam in one place as the day of the Fall (x. 962.); in another place it is described as a day several days subsequent to that of the Fall (x. 1050.).

"The creation of man is represented by Milton as a consequence of the vacuity left in heaven by the expulsion of the rebel angels; yet Satan himself mentions it as a report rife in heaven before his own rebellion." Elsewhere "the angel speaks of 'timorous deer' before deer were yet timorous, or at least before Adam could understand the comparison."[1]

In Lucian's Timon[2], Jupiter declares that for a long time past he had paid no attention whatever to the affairs of Athens; that he had not so much as turned his eyes in that direction; and the reason he assigns is, that the orators and sophists had filled the city with such an incessant clamour that he could no longer hear the prayers of his worshippers. In the immediate sequel, however[3],

[1] Johnson, Life of Milton, ed. Aikin, 1805, vol. i. p. 143. sq. Of Pindar and Dante, see Appendix A. to Vol. II.

[2] ix. [3] x.

he describes how, a day or two before, he had broken two of his best thunderbolts in a bad shot at Anaxagoras, teaching impiety in his school in that city.

The same Lucian in his "True History"[1] of Hades, gives an account of a lawsuit between Theseus and Menelaus before the tribunal of Rhadamanthus, each litigant claiming Helen as his lawful wife. Soon after, however, the historian[2] tells us that women were common property in Hades, and that nobody troubled himself with jealousies about such matters. This again is contradicted in the sequel[3], where Menelaus is described as prosecuting Helen before the same tribunal for her adulteries with Narcissus; and summary punishment is inflicted on both her and her paramour.

Walter Scott, in Rob Roy[4], first describes the adventure in the College church of Glasgow as on the week day devoted, according to Presbyterian custom, to the sacramental fast; but in the sequel the same transaction is made to take place on a Sunday.

In the Antiquary of the same author the scene is laid on the east coast of Scotland; yet, in the adventure of the storm on the beach, the sun is seen setting in the sea. Either, therefore (upon Wolfian principles), the sun, in Sir Walter's astronomy, must have set in the East, or this chapter is by a different hand.

The self-contradictions of Cervantes in his Don Quixote equal, or probably exceed in number, the whole collective mass of those in the Iliad, Odyssey, and Æneid united. Of the seventy chapters comprised in the second part of the work, there are few but contain statements totally irreconcilable with others occurring in previous or subsequent portions of the narrative. To analyse these discordances in detail would require a dissertation apart. A summary of them will be found in the "Chronological Plan" of the work prefixed to vol. I. of Jarvis's translation, ed. 1801.

The reader may judge for himself from these examples, the number of which might probably be augmented *ad nauseam*, of the value of Hermann's dogma, so formally and authoritatively laid down as the fundamental principle of his own school of Homeric criticism, "that no two passages of the same work contradictory to, or irreconcilable with, each other can be by one and the same author."[5]

[1] II. viii. [2] xix. [3] xxv. sq.

[4] 3rd ed. 1818, vol. II. vi. p. 122., viii. p. 162.

[5] "Dass was sich wiederspricht oder nicht vereinbar ist, nicht von einem und demselben Dichter seyn könne."—Opusc vol. VI. p. 147.

APPENDIX G. (p. 459.)

SUPPLEMENTARY REMARK ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE ILIAD.

Of the casuistry by which any argument in favour of the poet's own unity, which may be derived from the unity of his chronology, has been set aside, or rather perverted, there is a curious example in Heyne's elaborate analysis of the chronology of the Iliad.[1] He admits that no such discordance can be detected as to afford clear evidence of a previous independence of parts. The inference then, it may be presumed, is favourable to a single genuine Homer. Far from it: "Such subtlety is inconsistent with the free genius of the primitive bard, and betrays the artifice of the grammarian." In the sequel[2] however he observes, that although the general reckoning is correct, yet more events are here and there accumulated within a given time than could well have been accomplished. Here then surely is a redeeming point on the side of primitive artlessness. Not a whit: "The grammarian has but hampered himself by over-sedulity in the redaction of his stock of materials!" This is a species of two-edged logic which nothing can resist, and places the original genius of the poet as much at the mercy of those who wield it with such dexterity, as the lamb at the fountain was at the mercy of the wolf in the fable. Do what he will he must be in the wrong. If the waters are muddled, it is his fault that they are not pure; if they are pure, it is no merit of his that they are not muddled. The disingenuous partiality of this commentary appears the more glaring, if it be contrasted with the facility with which the same Heyne, in his parallel commentary on the Æneid of Virgil[3], overlooks or excuses the really flagrant chronological discrepancies of that poem. The fact that, while scarcely any two commentators have been able to agree as to the duration of the action of the Iliad, their speculations fluctuating between forty and fifty-three days[4], no palpable discrepancy has ever been detected in the poet's reckoning, is in itself, on Heyne's own principle, a powerful argument in favour of spontaneous simplicity against studied artifice of arrangement.

[1] Exc. I. ad Il. XVIII. [2] Loc. cit. p. 578.
[3] Exc. ad Æn. XII. [4] W. Müller, Hom. Vorsch. ed. 1836, p. 120.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

0056975

LONDON:
A. and G. A. SPOTTISWOODE,
New-street Square.

LIST OF NEW WORKS.

I.

A DIARY in TURKISH and GREEK WATERS. By the Right Hon. the Earl of Carlisle. *New Edition.* Post 8vo., price 10*s.* 6*d.*

II.

GLEANINGS from PICCADILLY to PERA. By JOHN W. OLDMIXON, Esq., Commander, R.N. With Illustrations in Colours. Post 8vo., price 10*s.* 6*d.*

III.

The BALTIC; its GATES, SHORES, and CITIES. With a Notice of the WHITE SEA. By the Rev. T. MILNER, M.A., F.R.G.S. Post 8vo., with Map, price 10*s.* 6*d.*

IV.

RUSSIA and TURKEY. By J. R. M'CULLOCH, Esq. Reprinted, with Corrections, from his Geographical Dictionary. 16mo., price One Shilling.

V.

SCHAMYL, the SULTAN, WARRIOR, and PROPHET of the CAUCASUS. Translated from the German of BODENSTEDT and WAGNER, by L. WRAXALL. 16mo., price One Shilling.

VI.

DE CUSTINE'S RUSSIA: abridged by the omission of irrelevant matter. 16mo., price 3*s.* 6*d.* cloth; or in 3 Parts, One Shilling each.

VII.

The RUSSIANS of the SOUTH. By SHIRLEY BROOKS. 16mo., price One Shilling.

VIII.

BELL'S HISTORY of RUSSIA, from the earliest Period to the Treaty of Tilsit (1807). 3 vols. fcp. 8vo., price 10*s.* 6*d.*

IX.

TRAVELS in SIBERIA. By S. S. HILL, Esq. With a large coloured Map of European and Asiatic Russia. 2 vols. post 8vo., price 24*s.*

X.

NORDURFARI; or, RAMBLES in ICELAND. By PLINY MILES. 16mo., price 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth; or 2 Parts, One Shilling each.

XI.

GERMANY from 1760 to 1814: or, Sketches of German Life from the Decay of the Empire to the Expulsion of the French. By Mrs. AUSTIN. Post 8vo., price 12*s.*

XII.

JERMANN'S PICTURES from ST. PETERSBURG. Translated by FREDERICK HARDMAN. 16mo., price 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth; or in 2 Parts, One Shilling each.

XIII.

TURKEY and CHRISTENDOM: An Historical Sketch of the Relations between the Ottoman Empire and the States of Europe. Reprinted from the *Edinburgh Review.* 16mo., price One Shilling.

London: LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, and LONGMANS.

XIV.

MEMOIRS of a MAITRE D'ARMES; or, Eighteen Months at St. Petersburg. By ALEXANDRE DUMAS. Translated by the Marquis of ORMONDE. 16mo., price 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth; or in 2 Parts, One Shilling each.

XV.

LAING'S NOTES of a TRAVELLER on France, Russia, Switzerland, Italy, and other parts of Europe during the present Century. *First series*, reprinted in the *Traveller's Library*. 16mo., price 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth; or in 2 Parts, One Shilling each.

XVI.

The CALENDAR of VICTORY: being a Record of British Valour and Conquest by Sea and Land, on every Day in the Year. Commenced by the late Major RICHARD JOHNS, R.M.; completed by Lieut. P. H. NICHOLAS, R.M. Fcp. 8vo.

XVII.

The LEIPSIC CAMPAIGN. By the Rev. G. R. GLEIG, M.A., Chaplain-General to the Forces. 16mo., price 2*s.* 6*d.* cloth; or in 2 Parts, One Shilling each.

XVIII.

MEMOIR of the DUKE of WELLINGTON: reprinted by permission from *The Times* newspaper. 16mo., price One Shilling.

XIX.

THIRTY YEARS of FOREIGN POLICY; or, a History of the Secretaryships of the Earl of Aberdeen and Viscount Palmerston. By the Author of *The Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli, M. P., a Literary and Political Biography*. 8vo.

XX.

MOUNTAINS and MOLEHILLS; or, Recollections of a Burnt Journal. By FRANK MARRYAT. 8vo., with numerous Illustrations on Wood and in Colours.

XXI.

MEMOIRS, JOURNAL, and CORRESPONDENCE of THOMAS MOORE. Edited by the Right Hon. Lord JOHN RUSSELL, M. P. With Portraits and Vignette Illustrations. Vols. I. to VI. post 8vo., price 10*s.* 6*d.* each.

XXII.

The Rev. SYDNEY SMITH'S ELEMENTARY SKETCHES of MORAL PHILOSOPHY, delivered at the Royal Institution in the years 1804, 1805, and 1806. Third Edition. Fcp. 8vo., price 7*s.*

XXIII.

The GEOGRAPHY of HERODOTUS developed, explained, and illustrated from Modern Researches and Discoveries. By J. TALBOYS WHEELER, F.R.G.S. With Maps and Plans. 8vo., price 18*s.*

XXIV.

The LIFE and TRAVELS of HERODOTUS in the Fifth Century before Christ: An Imaginary Biography founded on fact, and intended to illustrate the Manners, Religion, and Social Condition of the Greeks, Egyptians, Hebrews, Phœnicians, Babylonians, Persians, Scythians, and other Nations of the Ancient World, as they were in the days of Pericles and Nehemiah. By J. TALBOYS WHEELER, F.R.G.S. Post 8vo.

London: LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, and LONGMANS.

WORKS BY HENRY ROGERS.

THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH; or, a Visit to a

DEFENCE OF THE ECLIPSE OF FAITH, by

REASON AND FAITH: their Claims and Conflicts

ESSAYS selected from CONTRIBUTIONS to the

SELECTIONS from the CORRESPONDENCE of